DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 040 815 24 RC 004 471

AUTHOR	Coombs, L. Madison
TITLE	The Educational Disadvantage of the Indian American Student.
INSTITUTION	New Mexico State Univ., University Park. ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
BUREAU NO	BR-6-2469
PUB DATE	Jul 70
CONTRACT	OEC-1-6-062469-1574
NOTE	159p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC-$8.05
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Achievement, Agency Role, *American Indians, Attitudes, Biculturalism, Bilingual Education, Boarding Schools, Community Involvement, Curriculum Enrichment, *Disadvantaged Youth, *Education, Educational Disadvantagement, Educational Needs, Language Handicaps, *Research Reviews (Publications), Social Problems, Socioeconomic Background, Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

The main body of this research synthesis serves to point out research findings regarding the educationally disadvantaged Indian American school children. The decade of the 1960's is noted to be the significant period in bringing to the attention of educators and the American public the educational problems facing the Indian American. Some of the factors reported to be the underlying causes for the educational retardation of the Indian children include (1) the Federal Government's policy of coercive assimilation which has resulted in disorganization of the Indian communities, (2) a lack of self-fulfillment of Indian students at every age level, (3) the negative self-images of the Indian students, and (4) a lack of understanding of cultural differences on the part of many schools. The study cites the efforts of some schools to combat this problem through implementation of programs that are bicultural and bilingual in nature. The bibliography lists 153 relevant documents, the contents of which are synthesized in the monograph. (EL)

ED040815

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR
ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF
VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE EDUCATIONAL DISADVANTAGE OF THE INDIAN AMERICAN STUDENT

by

L. MADISON COOMBS
Formerly, Deputy Assistant Commissioner for Education
of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and
Director of Educational Research

EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
CLEARINGHOUSE ON RURAL EDUCATION AND SMALL SCHOOLS (CRESS)
New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, New Mexico 88001
July 1970

This publication was prepared pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

RC004471

CONTENTS

Chapter Page

Introduction.. 1

1. The Nation Discovers Its Disadvantaged Children....... 3

2. The Increasing Visibility of the Indian American...... 11

3. The Educational Disadvantage of the Indian American Student: Its Nature and Magnitude................ 19

4. Suggested Causes of the Educational Disadvantage...... 41

5. Proposed Remedies for the Educational Disadvantage.... 86

6. Unresolved Issues and Problems........................ 117

7. Concluding Remarks.................................... 140

References.. 142

INTRODUCTION

The Education of the American Indians: A Survey of the Literature, by Brewton Berry (20), appeared in February of 1969. In August of that same year, ERIC/CRESS issued American Indian Education, A Selected Bibliography by Cecilia J. Martinez and James E. Heathman (75). These two documents are basic points of departure for the present study.

Berry's survey of the literature provides historical perspective in viewing the problems of Indian education and the attempts to deal with them over a long period of time. The work is undoubtedly the most comprehensive ever attempted in the field of Indian American education, containing 708 references in the bibliography -- of which almost two-thirds bear dates prior to 1960. On the other hand, of the nearly 150 references in the ERIC bibliography by Martinez and Heathman, only three were published prior to 1960.

The present writer believes that the decade of the 1960's was an especially important one in the education of Indian Americans. Only the 1930's and the New Deal era, preceded by the landmark Meriam Survey in 1928, would be comparable. Consequently, the present survey aims at focusing on the decade of 1960-69 and particularly the latter part of it -- on some of the more important events and the thinking which brought about these events, as well as on the literature of the period. The scope of this paper is not sufficiently ambitious, however, to permit an exhaustive treatment of either. For example, many of the publications examined propose in great detail certain educational methods or techniques which can be reported only in capsular form.

An effort has been made to provide adequate documentation throughout. However, the record of how decisions come about in government is not always available to the public in published form, although serious scholars can usually gain access to this kind of information by recourse to government files. In those instances where documentation can be obtained only from government records, that fact will be indicated by an asterisk in parentheses.

It has also been thought desirable and necessary to mention research now in progress but not yet complete, to the extent of describing its objectives and anticipated completion dates.

Chapter 1

THE NATION DISCOVERS ITS DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN

It can be said that, during the decade of the 1960's, America discovered its educationally disadvantaged children. The nation displayed a developing concern about them and began, although imperfectly, to understand the causes of their disadvantage. For many years, educators had been saying a great deal about the individual differences among pupils and the need to take these differences into account in educational situations, although totally satisfactory ways of doing this had not been found. But no one seemed to be particularly aware that entire segments of the school population were characterized by educational deprivation and deficits. If such deficits were noted, they were likely to be viewed as stemming from supposed ethnic or cultural traits such as lack of motivation or of innate capacity.

In 1954, the United States Supreme Court ruled in the case of Brown vs. the Board of Education that the separate education of Negro children in segregated schools was inherently unequal and a denial of their constitutional rights. That decision set in motion forces which were to bear fruit ten years later. One of the effects of the Supreme Court decision was the suggestion that the causes of the educational deficits which afflicted people of minority groups lay not with the people themselves but with the institutions which served the people. Also, the Supreme Court's use of the term "unequal" carried a connotation of "inferior" with most people, and attempts to improve segregated schools in the conventional ways of improving buildings, equipment, libraries, and so forth did not satisfy.

Another historic event, which occurred in 1957, focused critical attention on the schools: the launching of the first Sputnik by the Soviet Union. Americans, suddenly realizing that we were behind in a technological race with the Soviets, were appalled. The schools were held accountable for not turning out more scientists and mathematicians -- for having indulged in a "soft" or "frilly" curriculum. It was charged that the academically talented students were not being helped to develop their full potential.

This latter event got the more immediate results so far as Federal participation was concerned, with the passage of the National Defense Education Act in 1958. The Act, while it gave some attention to fields such as foreign language and pupil guidance, was mainly concerned with strengthening teaching at the high school level in the physical sciences and mathematics. The school desegregation decision did not actually come to fruition until 1964, with the passage of the Civil Rights Act and the Economic Opportunity Act and with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. While the National Defense Education Act had a certain element of elitism about it with its concern for developing the highly academic areas of the curriculum, the three later acts were purely egalitarian in character -- aimed at equalizing the opportunities of persons at the lower end of the socioeconomic scale, a large proportion of whom were members of ethnic minorities.

The Measures of Educational Disadvantage

The educational deficits of socially and economically deprived children or of culturally different children can be described most easily in quantifiable terms and are usually so expressed. Performance on school achievement tests is lower, on the average, than that of the general population of children; a smaller percentage of them finish high school; and fewer of them enroll in college and graduate. Consequently, fewer of them get jobs, particularly good jobs, and so the spiral of deprivation and disadvantage continues.

It is much more difficult to express these deficits in qualitative terms -- for example, as a diminished level of the enjoyments and satisfactions of life -- and so less is said about that.

Criticism of the Schools

During the 1960's the public school system of the country was subjected to harsh criticism, and the criticism continues. As has been noted, the schools have been accused of doing a bad job with both the academically talented and the socially and economically disadvantaged. Now the schools are being held to account for the social alienation of large numbers of the middle-class children.

It is not the purpose of this monograph to defend the schools. Undoubtedly, much of the criticism is deserved since, historically, public schools have only reflected the prevailing values of their constituencies. The schools have not been pace-setters in social change and have been slow to adopt improvements available to them. Being public institutions, they have tended to try to satisfy the power structures of the communities they serve and, confronted with an unprecedented tide of enrollment, they have usually pitched their instructional programs toward the middle of the group, sometimes shortchanging both the gifted and the disadvantaged.

In an assessment of the situation, some perspective is needed, however. In a recent television interview with Martin Agronsky, statistician Ben Wattenberg pointed out that most or at least many Americans now believe that, because of an alarming school dropout rate, fewer youths are finishing high school than formerly. The exact opposite is true. A higher proportion of young people -- at least three out of four -- are now finishing high school; this is more than at any time in history. In 1967, approximately 73 percent of young adults (25 to 29 years of age) were high school graduates, and 15 percent had completed four or more years of college (91). High school graduation has become the norm rather than the exception that it was fifty years ago.

Some 56.4 million persons were in school in the fall of 1967 (91). In the nineteen years between 1947 and 1966, the percentage of all persons between the ages of 5 and 34 who were in school had risen from 42.3

percent to 60 percent; for 16- and 17-year-olds the increase was from 67.6 percent to 88.5 percent. The figures for the ethnic minorities are lower, but these too are rising and at an even faster rate.

Americans, however, have traditionally seen the public school system as "the great equalizer" -- a means by which any dream of any child can become viable. Having discovered in the 1960's that there were great educational inequalities among children, the people of the nation were impatient to have these deficits eliminated.

The Study of the Equality of Educational Opportunity

In 1965, the U. S. Office of Education carried out what was, no doubt, the most monumental -- and momentous -- study of education ever conducted. This study, entitled Equality of Educational Opportunity (33), was published in 1966 and has become known as the "Coleman Report" after its principal author, James S. Coleman of Johns Hopkins University. As an examination of equality of educational opportunity in the United States, the study was carried out in response to a mandate contained in the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which required that

> The Commissioner shall conduct a survey and make a report to the President and the Congress, within two years of the enactment of this title, concerning the lack of availability of equal educational opportunities for individuals by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin in public educational institutions at all levels in the United States, its territories and possessions, and the District of Columbia.

In commenting upon the Coleman Report, Daniel P. Moynihan (85) has said:

> Commissioned by Section 402 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the study began with a clear and untroubled understanding as to what the world was like. The U.S. Commissioner of Education was instructed within two years to report to the President and Congress "concerning the lack of availability of equal educational opportunities for individuals by reason of race, color, religion or national origin in public institutions." Two years later the second largest social science research project in history was released, almost furtively, by the Office of Education. The things "everybody knew" about education appeared from the massive collection of data -- not to be so! School facilities were not especially unequal as between the races, and where differences did exist they were not necessarily in the presumed direction. In any event it did not appear that school facilities had any great influence on educational achievement, which seemed mostly to derive from the family background of the child and the social class of his schoolmates. The whole rationale of American public education came very near to crashing down, and would have done so had there not been a seemingly general agreement to act as if the report had not occurred. But it had, and public education will not now be the same. (Emphasis added.)

The study written up in the Coleman Report (33) included 645,000 pupils who were enrolled in the first, third, sixth, ninth, and twelfth grades in 4,000 public schools in the fall of 1965. Several thousand of these children were Indian Americans. The study found that the children of the disadvantaged minorities did, indeed, score lower on the achievement tests given than did the white children:

> The difference between whites and the other racial and ethnic groups (excluding Orientals) is great indeed. The degree of educational disadvantage, at the end of 12 years of high school for those who remained in school that long, remains quite large.

But the report (33) had many other things to say which were not anticipated. For example:

> A . . . consideration to be kept in mind in examining variations in test scores and motivation is that school is only one factor affecting both achievement and motivation: differences in family background, and general influences of the society at large also have strong effects. Studies of school achievement have consistently shown that variations in family background account for far more variation in school achievement than do variations in school characteristics.

The report also said that

> The schools do differ, however, in their relation to the various racial and ethnic groups. The average white student's achievement seems to be less affected by the strengths and weaknesses of his school's facilities, curriculum, and teachers than is the average minority pupil's. *To put it another way, the achievement of minority pupils depends more on the schools they attend than does the achievement of majority pupils*. (Emphasis added.)

Perhaps it is not to be wondered at that there were those who were unhappy about the Coleman Report. It seemed to present the schools as a somewhat blurred target for the most virulent criticism which sought to fasten the responsibility for all educational inequality upon them. And, on the other hand, the schools were not entirely happy about what might seem to be their somewhat diminished role.

In this connection, Anderson and Safar (144) have made a most cogent comment:

> With the belated realization of the extent to which a student's background drastically affects his performance in school, a third approach has been adopted, namely, to assume that students from culturally impoverished homes are *de facto* subject to unequal educational opportunities.

In other words, schools for disadvantaged pupils need to be better than ordinary schools if they are to redress the inequality. As the Coleman Report (33) comments:

> Whatever may be the combination of nonschool factors -- poverty, community attitudes, low educational level of parents -- which put minority children at a disadvantage in verbal and nonverbal skills when they enter the first grade, the fact is the schools have not overcome it.

The implications of the foregoing, if accepted, fix a greater responsibility upon the schools than they have heretofore been called upon to assume. It amounts to a mandate to schools and the communities which support them to make whatever input is necessary in terms of money, professional skill, or innovative, differentiated, educational programs to permit disadvantaged pupils to attain equality.

Chapter 2

THE INCREASING VISIBILITY OF THE INDIAN AMERICAN

One of the disadvantages of Indian Americans has been that they are not only an ethnic minority but they are a minuscule minority -- some 600,000 persons in a nation of 200,000,000. However grave their economic, social, and political problems may be, it has been difficult for the country to see them in contemporary terms. While, as Berry (20) has pointed out, there has been a plethora of writing about Indians, much of it has been about the past -- either serious studies or popular and romantic conceptions, or misconceptions, of a bygone era.

It was not difficult, however, to document the fact that Indians, as a group, are among the most deprived people in America in terms of income, jobs, housing, health, and education (134) (65). The average family income of Indians has been estimated at $1500, which is 75 percent below the national average; their unemployment rate is nearly 40 percent, which is ten times the national figure; some 50,000 Indian families live in unsanitary, dilapidated dwellings; the average age of death among Indian Americans is 44 years, compared with 65 years for the general population; Indian youths drop out of school at a much higher rate than the general population; and their school achievement lags from one to three years behind children in the dominant culture. When the problems of the poor began at last, then, to receive national attention, the Indian American attained a national visibility which had theretofore been denied him.

National Legislation Affects Indian Americans

The Economic Opportunity Act of 1965 provided for numerous programs, of which units were instituted in Indian communities. Among these were Head Start for preschool children; Upward Bound for academically talented but underachieving students; the Job Corps, with several centers being operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA); and VISTA, with numerous volunteers working in Indian communities. Most significant of all, perhaps, were the Community Action Programs which afforded Indian communities an opportunity to play a more active role in attacking their own community problems.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, also passed in 1965, was not pointed at ethnic minorities per se. Its selection criterion was poverty, and pupils from families with incomes of less than $2,000 per year were designated as its beneficiaries. In general, the Act envisaged compensatory education programs designed to offset the effects of social and economic deprivation. Obviously, a high proportion of Indian pupils, as well as those of other ethnic minorities, qualified under the poverty criterion. A high proportion of the nearly 90,000 Indian students attending public schools became immediately eligible for the benefits of the Act, but the approximately 50,000 pupils (29) attending Federal schools were not according to the bill as it was originally passed. The law was amended in the following session of Congress, however, and the BIA has participated since that time. Some significant developments which will be discussed later flowed from that amendment.

Study Groups Look at Indian Americans

In the spring of 1966, at the request of the Senate Subcommittee on Education, the Department of the Interior and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare collaborated on a study of the question of organizational location of Indian education within the Federal Government. While this interdepartmental study group (135), in May of 1967, advised against transfer of the Federal Government's responsibility for the education of Indians to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare at that time, it did call for the development of a high-quality educational program for Indians and for greater support of BIA programs by the Office of Education, including a stronger research effort.

Also in 1966, a Presidential study group was named to examine the entire range of Indian Affairs. Its membership and proceedings were confidential, and its report to the White House was never released officially although some later developments of importance seem clearly to have resulted from it.

The National Indian Education Advisory Committee

Late in 1966, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs appointed a National Indian Education Advisory Committee to advise him and the Assistant

Commissioner for Education on the development and implementation of educational programs for Indians. This all-Indian sixteen-member committee represents all sections of the Indian Country, with most members being elected tribal leaders. The committee meets quarterly in different parts of the country and, although there have been changes in its membership, it has continued to function.

National Research Conference on American Indian Education

On May 24-27, 1967, the U. S. Office of Education, pursuant to the recommendation of the interdepartmental study group, called a national research conference on American Indian education at Pennsylvania State University. Funded by the Office of Education, the conference was conducted under the auspices of The Society for the Study of Social Problems, a professional organization of social scientists. The conference recommended a national research study of Indian education (6).

The National Study of American Indian Education

As early as 1956, Congress had authorized a national study of Indian education, but as happens not infrequently funds had never been appropriated to carry it out. Following the research conference at Pennsylvania State University, the Office of Education (through its Bureau of Research) earmarked funds for the study and negotiated a contract with the University of Chicago. Robert J. Havighurst, long prominent in Indian education research, was named director. He, in turn, named an advisory board with six of its twelve members being drawn from the National Indian Education Advisory Committee. The study began in 1968 and is scheduled for completion by the end of 1970 (57).

The Senate Subcommittee on Indian Education

On August 31, 1967, the U. S. Senate authorized the creation, under the parent Committee of Labor and Public Welfare, of a Subcommittee on Indian Education distinct from the Subcommittee on Education. The resolution authorized "an investigation into the problems of education for American Indians." The subcommittee issued its final report (134) on November 1, 1969, more than two years after its inception. In the interim, it held hearings both in Washington, D.C., and at five locations throughout the country; it hired consultants to investigate educational programs; and it gathered and published reams of information about the education of Indians, including entire publications, some of which are cited separately in the present study. In conclusion, the subcommittee issued sixty recommendations for the improvement of education for Indian Americans.

The Special Presidential Message to the Congress and the National Council on Indian Opportunity

Finally, on March 6, 1968, President Johnson (65) sent to Congress a special message on goals and programs for the Indian American. He cited the contribution which the Indian American has made to the nation and the current state of his disadvantage. The President announced national goals for the improvement of the Indian's conditions and proposed programs for improving these conditions. He also announced creation of the National Council on Indian Opportunity with the Vice-President as chairman and six cabinet officers as members.

Certainly not since the New Deal days of the 1930's, and possibly never before, had the contemporary problems and needs of Indian Americans been so exposed to public view as during the years from 1965 to 1969.

The Status of Research in Indian Education

One effect of the foregoing events has been to enhance, somewhat, the position of research in the field of Indian American education. Even so, the BIA has not yet been successful in making any real breakthrough in securing adequate appropriations for educational research. And, with the exception of the National Study of American Indian Education, the Office of Education has been able to allocate only limited funds in this field.

That there is a need for a greater research effort seems to be clear. Herbert E. Striner (129), voicing a concern of the Presidential Task Force (the report of which was never released), had this to say in a paper of limited circulation entitled _Toward a Fundamental Program for the Training, Employment, and Economic Equality of the American Indian_:

> The major Federal agency entrusted with the task of dealing with Indian problems itself has no integral research programs. . . . It is difficult to obtain data concerning these programs. Indeed, one is overwhelmed by the inadequacy of data on Indian education (and on Indian problems in general) and the inadequate effort being directed to correct this deficiency. The complexity of the problems associated with Indian education merits substantial research and development efforts and strong determination to adopt promising innovations as they appear.

And yet, there were divergent points of view expressed at the national conference at Pennsylvania State University (6). Some delegates felt that research findings of the past have made no real difference in programs or results and that research in the future is not likely to change the situation either. Some conference participants stated that enough is known now -- that we need to get on with the job.

In some ways, it has been a difficult era in which to conduct research. The decade of the 1960's was a time of controversial social issues, not the least controversial of which was the education of Indian American children. Feelings ran high and points of view tended to become polarized. Research and polemics sometimes ran together and became intermingled. Studies differed in their character.

However, the Coleman Report (33), for example, managed to remain research in spite of the explosive subject with which it dealt -- but it came up with unanticipated and unpopular findings which, as Moynihan has said, the country has handled by trying to pretend the study never happened.

The report of the Senate Subcommittee on Indian Education (134) was, on the other hand, understandably of a somewhat different nature. Congressional committees nearly always approach investigations with well-formulated objectives. By means of a purposeful staff, the selection of consultants and witnesses, and placing emphasis on certain findings while muting others, progress toward objectives is achieved.

There have been some real gains in educational research on Indians as a result of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. One of these has been the establishment of various regional educational laboratories. Several of these have assumed responsibility for research and development in the field of Indian education. Prominent among these have been the Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory at Albuquerque, the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory at Portland, the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development at Berkeley, and the Upper Midwest Regional Educational Laboratory at St. Paul. Also significant has been the establishment of the ERIC Clearinghouses, particularly ERIC/CRESS at New Mexico State University which has assumed responsibility for gathering literature on education of the Indian American.

These new institutions have helped bring a focus to the research needs of Indian education which has not been possible in the past.

Chapter 3

THE EDUCATIONAL DISADVANTAGE OF THE INDIAN AMERICAN STUDENT: ITS NATURE AND MAGNITUDE

Much has been written of the educational deficits of Indian Americans. Indeed, by almost every kind of measure, Indian students and their elders lag behind the general population of the country in educational attainment. It will be seen that this is true with respect to enrollment in school, achievement as measured by standardized tests, overageness, number of years of schooling, school completion, college enrollment, and college graduation. These are the kinds of deficits which can be expressed in quantitative terms; they are the ones most often cited and of which the general public is most likely to be aware. It is also commonly assumed that the other disadvantages from which Indian American people suffer -- with respect to income, employment, housing, and health -- either have been caused by lack of education or, at the very least, have not been relieved due to lack of education.

The literature of the past ten years, and particularly the last five, has dwelt upon these deficits. The Senate Subcommittee on Indian Education (134) has reported that achievement levels of Indian children are two to three years below those of white students, and the Indian child falls progressively behind the longer he stays in school; dropout rates are twice the national average in both public and Federal schools -- with some school districts having dropout rates approaching 100 percent; the average educational level for all Indians under Federal supervision is five school years; more than one out of every five Indian men has fewer than five years of schooling; 40,000 Navajo Indians, nearly one-third of the entire tribe, are functional illiterates in English, and only 18 percent of the students in Federal Indian schools go on to college, whereas the national average is 50 percent.

Less has been said or written, however, about the rather substantial progress which has taken place during the past decade, at least in quantitative terms, although there is clear evidence of such progress. Perhaps it has not suited the purposes of reform-minded scholars and others to stress this. It seems possible, however, that the unrelievedly dismal picture which has been put forward has reached the point of being counterproductive so far as Indian morale is concerned, particularly in view of the rather gallant effort which Indian people have made to raise their educational status. It often happens that social inequities come to public attention only after the situation has begun to improve. In any case, it is important, if only for the sake of accuracy, to present a more nearly balanced picture.

School Census and School Enrollment

According to statistics released annually by the BIA (29), in 1968 there were 152,000 Indian children between the ages of 6 and 18 in what the BIA refers to as its "service population"-- that is, Indian people for whom the BIA provides educational services, either directly or by financial aid to public schools. In 1961 there had been only 125,000 children in this age span -- an increase of 27,000 children in seven years. Of the 152,000 Indian children of school age in 1968, nearly 143,000 (or 94 percent) were enrolled in school. That was probably not as high a percentage as was true for the general population of children in the United States. [According to the U. S. Office of Education (91), in 1966 from 97.6 to 99.3 percent of children from ages 6 through 15 were in school although this fell off to 88.5 percent for 16- and 17-year-olds.] It was, however, higher than the 90 percent of Indian school age children who were in school in 1961 (113,000 of 125,000 children). In other words, in seven years the public and Federal schools had absorbed an additional 27,000 children; had increased the school enrollment from 90 to 94 percent; and had reduced the out-of-school figure from 10,000 to 7,000. Also during that time, the proportion of Indian children enrolled in public schools had increased from 57 to 61 percent, and the proportion in BIA and mission schools had decreased from 35 to 33 percent and from 8 to 6 percent, respectively. (See Table I, which was constructed from records in BIA files.)

TABLE I

CENSUS AND SCHOOL ENROLLMENT OF INDIANS AGED 6 TO 18

	Census	Enrollment		
		Bureau	Public	Mission
1968	152,000*	47,000 (33%)	87,000 (61%)	9,000 (6%)
1961	125,000*	39,000 (35%)	65,000 (57%)	9,000 (8%)
	27,000 gain	8,000 gain	22,000 gain	000

	Not in School	No Information
1968	7,000	3,000
1961	10,000	3,000
	-3,000	000

	Total Enrollment	
1968	143,000	94% in school
1961	113,000	90% in school

*Because of errors occasioned by rounding to the nearest thousand, enrollment and out-of-school figures do not equal census figures exactly.

It must be pointed out that the enrollment figures available are more reliable than the census figures. As Kelly (67) makes clear in his study of school age Indian children in southern Arizona, neither the BIA nor the public schools have adequate census data. He says, "The only feasible answer is a data bank for southern Arizona, but sooner or later they will be needed in all areas." Kelly does say, however, that "With extremely few exceptions, Indian children remain in school through the eighth grade."

An even more notable case of improvement in school enrollment is provided by the Navajo Tribe. In 1962, Coombs (35) reported that "In 1946 only 6,000 Navajo children between the ages of 6 and 18 were in school and an estimated 18,000 were not." By 1968, however, records (29) show that 42,457 of 46,869 Navajo children between the ages of 6 and 18 were enrolled in school (or more than 90 percent). And, as data to be presented later will show, Navajo youths are now finishing high school at the rate of 70 percent.

Young (151) provides some insight as to how this improvement was accomplished:

> On March 3, 1954, the Council (Navajo) adopted a resolution authorizing the Commissioner to take whatever steps might be necessary, in his estimation, to accomplish the objective of universal education for the Tribe and the Navajo Emergency Education Program, commonly known as NEEP, was thus born. The immediate objective was to provide seats for an additional 7,946 Navajo children by September of the same year, to thus raise enrollment to a minimum of 22,052 children. . . .
>
> Accomplishment of the immediate objective of increasing enrollment by 7,946 children by the fall of 1954 through initiation of a crash program was realized - in fact, the objective was surpassed.

Young then states that this was done by complete utilization of existing facilities on the reservation, by the institution of trailer schools, and by temporary arrangements with "bordertown" communities near the reservation.

Some commentators such as Sizemore and her colleagues (121) suggest that Indian tribal governments should enforce school attendance. As a matter of fact, most tribes, including the Navajo, do have compulsory education ordinances in their legal codes. Kelly (50) has commented, however, that Indians are sensitive in their interpersonal relations and are reluctant to coerce one another; in this vein, Young (150) has pointed out that neither Navajo religion nor politics is coercive and that Navajo society in general is not coercive. It will be noted that Yazzie (149), in a statement prepared for the Senate Subcommittee on Education, listed as one of the annual activities of the Navajo Tribal Council a "Back to School" campaign each fall, based upon education and persuasion rather than coercion.

Average Number of Years of Schooling

Adequate data are lacking on the average level of schooling attained by Indian American adults. Neither the BIA nor the several state departments of education have such data and, as Kelly (67) has pointed out, will not have until data banks are established and adequate census procedures are put into effect. Pending such a time, the most reliable data come from decennial United States Census of Population conducted by the Bureau of the Census (25).

The 1960 Census revealed that the average number of years of schooling for all Indian adults was 8.4 years, compared with a national figure for the adult population of 10.6 years. For the crucial young adult population (14 to 24 years of age) the figure for Indians was 9.0 years, compared with 10.8 years for the general population. This was a net gain of .8 years for the Indian population in the ten years since the 1950 Census.

In addition, the 1960 Census showed that there were 57,000 Indian people in the country who had graduated from high school, as compared with 24,000 in 1950 (an increase of 140 percent). And there were 17,000 Indian people in 1960 who had completed one or more years of college, compared with 6,500 in 1950 (an increase of 160 percent).

Also, in 1968 the BIA high schools graduated 2,041 students compared with 841 ten years earlier. The exact number of Indian students graduating from public and private high schools each year is not known, but based upon the proportions of enrollment in the several types of schools the BIA conservatively estimates (*) that at least 5,000 Indian students received high school diplomas in 1968.

This report is being written just as the 1970 United States Census is getting under way; thus, the breakdown by racial and ethnic groups will not be completed by the Bureau of the Census for a couple of years. It is quite predictable, however, that the level of educational attainment of both Indian Americans and the general population will show an increase in absolute terms. It will be interesting to see whether Indians will advance by comparison with the general population.

School Achievement

As Berry (20) has pointed out, no aspect of Indian education has been more busily researched than the school learning of Indian children as measured by standardized tests. Berry and, more recently, Edington (40) have synthesized the findings of this research, citing, among many others, Coombs (36) and Bryde (23). Zintz (152) also conducted such testing in 1960 with Indian children in the public schools of New Mexico, as did Martin (19) in 1962 with Navajo pupils in the public school at Window Rock, Arizona. All of these researchers found not only that Indian students achieved well below white students but also that they fell further behind as the higher grades were reached. This phenomenon has been called "progressive retardation." Coombs, whose study included nearly 14,000 Indian pupils and nearly 10,000 white pupils in eleven states, found that while Indian pupils did not compare too unfavorably with white children at the fourth-grade level, they progressively declined from that point on through the twelfth grade. Bryde (23), on the other hand, tested more than 400 Sioux pupils and more than 200 white pupils in South Dakota. He reported that the Indian pupils actually did better on the tests than the white pupils in the fourth, fifth, and sixth grades, then fell behind in the seventh grade and declined from that point on. This he called the "crossover phenomenon" for obvious reasons.

On this entire question, the Coleman Report (33) has thrown important light. It confirmed that Indian children achieved at a lower level than white children at all grade levels tested (grades 1, 3, 6, 9, and 12) and at an increasing rate of retardation. The report also revealed, however, that all minority ethnic groups achieved below the white children and all except Oriental Americans -- that is, Indian Americans, Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, and Negroes -- were well below the mean of the total group. And, most significantly, the report showed that all socially and economically disadvantaged groups became progressively retarded: "At the 12th grade, results of tests in the same verbal and nonverbal skills show that, in every case, the minority scores are further below the majority than are the 1st graders. For some groups the relative decline is negligible; for others it is large."

Most unexpected of all, perhaps, was the revelation that of the disadvantaged ethnic minorities (excluding Oriental Americans) the Indian Americans achieved highest. The Coleman Report says: "The order of the racial and ethnic groups is nearly the same on all tests. Following the whites in order are Orientals, Indians, Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, and Negroes."

In a continuing study of the Coleman data, the U. S. Office of Education has said:

> The white students are between 3 to 4 test points above the national means for all 3 tests (verbal ability, reading comprehension, and mathematics) and at all grade levels (6, 9, and 12). The Oriental-Americans approximate the national

> mean for 2 of the 3 tests and substantially exceed the national mean in the mathematics test for the 9th and 12th grades.
>
> The remaining minority groups are all substantially below the national mean; they exhibit, however, very similar characteristics over subject matter. For example, for all 3 tests, the Mexican-Americans are constantly between 8 to 10 test score points below the national mean for all grades. The American Indians and Negroes show the characteristic decreasing learning rates although at much different absolute rates, i.e., the Negro curve has a much more rapid decline. . . .
>
> Among the minority groups (except Oriental-Americans), in terms of rank comparisons, the American Indians show the least drop measured from the national means -- followed very closely by the Mexican-Americans. The Negro test scores are higher than the Puerto Ricans or Mexicans in 2 out of 3 tests at the 6th grade level, but by the 12th grade, the Negroes are the lowest of the minority groups.

With reference to the Coleman Report, Bass and Burger (11) have noted that "In twelfth grade verbal ability the Indian scores tend to be almost one standard deviation below that of the majority. This means that about 85% of the Indian scores are below the average of the majority versus only about 50% of the whites."

The Southwestern Cooperative Laboratory (9) has found, in a longitudinal study of 3,500 Indian students which is now in progress, that at the ninth-grade level Indian students were, on the average, from 1 to 1.5 grade levels below the national averages but that twelfth graders were from 2.5 to 3 grades behind. In general corroboration with the finding of the Coleman Report, the SWCEL study (10) also indicates that type of school is not a prime determiner of the achievement of the child:

> It should be noted that significant differences in achievement between school types (Federal on-reservation, Federal off-reservation, public on-reservation, and public off-reservation)

> were found for only three of sixteen categories and no clear pattern of superiority is evident in these three. Obviously, the evidence leads to the conclusion that when individual differences in scholastic aptitude and academic ability were controlled, differences in achievement between students in the four types of schools were negligible in 1967-68.
>
> These findings are in contrast with the findings for 1966-67 in which differences in achievement were found to be significant in ten of sixteen categories and revealed a hierarchical pattern for school types. This general pattern from high to low was Federal on-reservation, Federal off-reservation, public on-reservation, public off-reservation.

Overageness

Good recent studies of the overageness of Indian pupils ("scholastic retardation" to use Coleman's phrase) are lacking. Kelly (67) has provided excellent data for three tribes in southern Arizona, but figures which purport to describe the present situation on a national or even a regional basis are hard to come by. Coleman cites 1960 Census data, which show the overageness of Indian school children to be very high — higher than for any other ethnic group. In 1960, some 29.2 percent of Indian children 10 to 13 years of age were enrolled in a grade below the modal grade for their age. For older Indian youths the percentages were even higher: 41.5 percent of 14- and 15-year-olds and 43.3 percent of 16- and 17-year-olds.

Berry (20) reported that overageness is a common problem and says that this has been so since the Meriam Survey of 1928, although some studies have reported improvement in this area. Berry also stated that almost every investigator has noted the overageness of Indian pupils. Coombs (36) reported in 1958 that Indian pupils in Federal schools were, on the average, slightly more than one year older than white pupils in the same grade. He said,"It seems probable that the overageness of Indian pupils is accounted for not only by late school entrance, but also by the necessity for a beginning year for many of them in which basic social and conversational skills are taught, and by the fact of irregular attendance."

In a study of 5,762 Papago, Pima, and Maricopa children reported in 1967, Kelly (67) showed the following comparison of Indian children with all students in the Arizona public schools:

	Indian Students (%)	Other Students (%)
Above grade	1.2	19.6
At grade	36.3	59.4
One year behind	44.3	16.2
Two years behind	14.4	3.6
Three or more years behind	3.8	1.1

In the comparison of Papago children between the years of 1953 and 1966-67, Kelly showed evidence of progress:

	Papago Students in 1953 (%)	Papago Students in 1966-67 (%)
Above grade	.2	1.4
At grade	22.4	39.6
One year behind	32.2	46.1
Two years behind	21.0	11.2
Three or more years behind	24.2	1.7

He commented: "The great improvement is in the reduction of the number of students who are three or more years behind in grade."

Kelly also pointed out that the age-grade lag is caused by late school entrance and retention in grade during the first three years. He noted that

> No one knows why Indian families, in fairly large number, fail to send their children to school at the age of six and no one knows why almost ten percent of those in the first through third grades were retained in grade in the fall of 1966. A field survey, based upon a sample of all southern Arizona Indian children, ages five through eight, in and out of school, would fill great gaps in our knowledge of Indian education.

Dropouts

Berry (20) cites a long list of school dropout studies, extending over a period of twenty years or more, and says: "Far more serious than overageness is the shockingly high dropout rate. No report on Indian education fails to note its wide extent." He concludes by characterizing the dropout problem as a "national scandal." The Senate Subcommittee on Indian Education (134) says that Indian dropout rates are "twice the national average in both public and Federal schools" and notes that some schools have dropout rates approaching 100 percent.

While there is no reason to doubt that the Indian dropout problem is very serious, the fact is that reliable dropout data have been very hard to find. There are several reasons for this. For one thing, many of the studies cited by Berry are quite old and probably need updating. Furthermore, most of the studies, both old and new, have been local in scope and even when patched together do not present a comprehensive picture. Finally, some of the citations are simply a matter of persons quoting other persons' estimates, some of them ten years old.

For example, in 1959 the BIA issued an "inhouse" working document titled Today's Dropouts - Tomorrow's Problems, in which it estimated from such data as it had available that the Indian dropout rate in both Federal and public schools was about 60 percent, compared with a national dropout rate of approximately 40 percent. That figure has been quoted frequently, even within the last two or three years. In 1968 the White House, while preparing President Johnson's Indian message, asked the BIA for a dropout figure and, in the absence of firm data, was given an estimate of 50 percent. That figure is now in the process of getting "locked in" as official.

In 1962, Ray (109) reported on an excellent study of the rural native students of Alaska. He noted that only 34 percent of Alaska's 5,368 youths of high school age (14 to 19 years) were actually enrolled in school. The remainder had either left school or had been retained in lower grades. Ray, however, listed a lack of secondary school facilities as one of the causes of dropout. Since that time (*), through the joint efforts of the State of Alaska and the BIA, the number of high school seats available to rural native Alaskans has nearly quadrupled and the seats have been filled. While this has not solved the problem, it has almost certainly relieved it.

There have been some useful recent studies. Woods (147) reported in 1968 that a study done with the support of the Minneapolis League of Women Voters revealed the following facts about Indian students in the public schools of that city. Of 1,357 pupils enrolled, 950 were in the elementary grades, 266 in junior high school, and 141 in senior high school; however, only 10 received high school diplomas that year. The dropout rate was estimated at 60 percent.

In 1966, Poehlman (102) reported that of the 1,902 Indian students enrolled in the public schools in Nevada, 67 received high school diplomas that year and only 24 dropped out, compared with 30 dropouts in 1965 and 34 in 1964.

Smail (123), in a well-done but little-publicized study of graduates and dropouts of Lathrop High School in Fairbanks, Alaska, found that "A definite dropout problem existed among the native students. The percentage of natives dropping out of school before graduation was two and one-half times as great as the non-natives."

Kelly (67), in his study of the Indian children of southern Arizona in 1966-67, found that the high school dropout rate was serious, with 22.3 percent of all Indian students between the ages of 16 and 18 leaving school before graduation. The rate for girls was higher (24.5 percent).

Large-scale dropout studies, if done properly, require a good deal of time, effort, and money. They should be done longitudinally -- that is, by following children individually through their school careers as they are promoted, change schools, drop out, perhaps re-enroll, and finally either graduate or leave school before graduation, never to return. Most so-called national dropout rates are arrived at simply by taking the number of high school graduates in a given year and comparing it with the number of ninth graders three years earlier, or eighth graders four years earlier, or fifth graders seven years earlier. For a number of reasons, this straightaway kind of comparison is not feasible with Indian youths.

To fill this vacuum of information about Indian dropouts, the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory at Portland, Oregon, and the Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory at Albuquerque, New Mexico, recently undertook longitudinal studies of Indian youths in their regions. These separate but coordinated studies, which may be considered together, have been reported on by Selinger (117) and by Owens and Bass (99), respectively. In a scientifically selected sample, some 2,057 Indians who had been enrolled in the eighth grade in the fall of 1962 were traced individually through their school careers. Of this total, 840 were studied by Selinger in the public, private, and Federal schools in the states of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota. Owens and Bass studied 1,217 Indian students in the schools in Arizona, New Mexico, Nevada, Oklahoma, southern Colorado, and southern Utah. Selinger traced the Northwest students for five years, through the school year 1966-67. Owens and Bass traced their group for one additional year, through the spring of 1968.

The investigators found that, of the composite group of 2,057 students, 1,177 (or 57.2 percent) had either graduated from high school or were still in school and presumably would graduate; ten (or .5 percent) were deceased; and 870 (or 42.3 percent) had dropped out. There was a higher rate of dropout in the northwestern states, which Selinger fixed at 47.7 percent. In the southwestern states, Owens and Bass found that 38.7 percent had dropped out. The comparable national dropout rate at that time was slightly more than 26 percent.

It is seen, then, that the best current figure on the Indian dropout rate is now somewhat more than 1.5 times that of the general population. It has declined 18 percentage points from the BIA's estimate made in 1959 and is 8 percentage points less than the estimate given in the President's message of 1968. In 1959, the national dropout rate was 37 percent. In the decade of the 1960's, therefore, the Indian dropout rate declined 7 percentage points more than that of the general population.

Selinger (117) found that girls were more likely to drop out of school than boys and that graduates were more regular in their school attendance than dropouts. Significantly, the flow charts contained in his report show a great deal of mobility among Indian students, with some individuals changing schools four or five times.

Unlike Selinger, Owens and Bass (99) made comparisons among tribal groups and among states. They found that 85 percent of Hopi students and more than 70 percent of Navajo students were finishing high school. The completion rate for Papago and Pueblo students was 67 and 62 percent, respectively. Apache youths had a disastrously high dropout rate of almost 59 percent and, disappointingly, considering the assumed degree of acculturation in the state, the dropout rate for Oklahoma Indian youths appeared to run about 45 percent for most tribes. Among the states, Nevada's dropout rate was lowest with 32.6 percent; New Mexico's was 33.9 percent; Arizona's was 34.7 percent; and Oklahoma's was 44.7 percent.

Nearly 12 percent of the dropouts in the Southwest study occurred between the eighth and ninth grades.

Somewhat unrelated, but of interest nevertheless, is the fact that of the 840 students in the Northwest study only 3 (or .3 percent) had died *from any cause* in the five-year period of the study. Of the 1,217 in the Southwest study, 7 (or .6 percent) had died over a six-year period.

College Enrollment and College Graduation

As in the case of school dropouts, data on the college enrollment and graduation of Indian students have, until lately, been entirely unsatisfactory -- limited and fragmentary. Berry (20) noted that the percentage of the Indian population attending college in 1961 was one-half of 1 percent, compared with 2 percent for the general population. He also found, however, that the proportion of Indian youths enrolling in college is rising and quoted Havighurst as reporting that, in 1936, only 1 out of 50 Indian high school graduates attended college whereas, in 1950, 1 in 6 graduates of Federal high schools was enrolled in college. Berry estimated that at least 4,000 Indian students are now attending college.

In 1962, in one of the best studies done up to that time, McGrath et al. (78) studied Indian college students in Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah. There was evidence that the proportion of Indian students succeeding in college was even lower than the proportion attending. During the period from September of 1958 through January of 1962, some 416 Indian in-school students were identified but 237 dropouts were also identified. Of 402 students for whom grade point averages were available, only 26 had a grade average of 2.75 or higher; 35 percent had less than a "C" average (2.00).

In 1966, Salisbury (115) reported that one-eighth of the entering freshmen at the University of Alaska were native, that 50 percent would drop out before the end of the freshman year, and that only 2 percent would graduate. Lekanof (70) cited a study by Janet Herreid of the University of Alaska which found that when students in the 1962 freshman class were compared to see what percent were enrolled for a fourth consecutive semester, only 23 percent of the natives compared with 49 percent of the non-natives were present. Of the two groups, 46.2 percent of the natives compared with 20 percent of the non-natives had been disqualified academically.

Ashe (5) found, in 1966, while surveying the feasibility of a Navajo community college, that 81 percent of the out-of-school high school graduates said they would have attended college if there had been one on the reservation.

Woods (147), in a 1968 study of Indian students in Minneapolis, found that 161 students were in college on scholarships totaling nearly $150,000 and that most of these were attending the University of Minnesota, Macalester College, St. Teresa, St. Cloud, Bemidji State, or some smaller schools.

Harkins and Woods (56) have reported that, of 135 Minneapolis Indian youths completing a questionnaire in 1969, some 95 indicated an interest in attending a university. Most of these young people, although currently living in Minneapolis, had been born in upper Minnesota.

Again, in an effort to secure more nearly definitive information about Indians in college and in other kinds of post-high school educational programs, the BIA engaged the help of the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory and the Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory. Selinger, for the former, reported in 1968 on The American Indian Graduate: After High School, What? (116) and Bass reported for his region in 1969 on The American Indian High School Graduate in the Southwest (8).

Selinger made individual studies of 287 Indian high school graduates in the six-state region of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota. He found that 202 graduates (or slightly more than 70 percent) had pursued some kind of educational course beyond high school. Of these, 106 (or 52 percent) had completed the course of training they had entered. Of the 287 in the entire group, 83 (or nearly 30 percent) had entered college. Of these, 24 had graduated and received degrees. Those receiving degrees represented 8.3 percent of the total number of high school graduates in the study, 11.8 percent of those who had pursued further training, and 29 percent of those who had entered college.

Bass (8) reported that, of 384 Indian high school graduates studied in the Southwest, 285 (or 74 percent) had continued their education beyond high school. Of these 285 continuers, 197 (or 69 percent) had completed either a vocational-technical program or had graduated from college. This represented 51 percent of all the students in the study. A total of 44 percent of the graduates had completed vocational programs, and 7 percent had graduated from college.

The BIA (*) awarded scholarship grants-in-aid totaling more than $3 million to approximately 3,100 Indian college students during the 1968-69 school year. Tribal scholarships totaling at least $1.1 million and grants from private sources helped hundreds more students. The BIA estimates, conservatively, that there were at least 4,400 Indian students in college in 1968-69. The Havighurst National Study (57) is expected to place that figure at about 6,000. In 1967-68 the BIA assisted

2,660 college students, of whom 180 received degrees. In addition, the BIA provides vocational-technical training for about 3,600 high school graduates at Haskell Institute, at The Institute of American Indian Arts, or through its adult vocational training program.

In summary, there is evidence of a serious deficit, but encouraging progress, with respect to the proportion of Indian students enrolled in school, the average number of years of schooling of young Indian adults, the proportion of Indian youths finishing high school, and the proportion going on to post-high school education, including college. These are quantitative gains, which are easily brought about. It seems probable that in qualitative terms the going is harder and the gains are smaller -- that is, Indian high school graduates still achieve, on the average, two or three grade levels below the national norms, and far too few students who enter college stay to graduate.

There are other kinds of educational goals and hoped-for outcomes which the foregoing figures do not describe, however. Even if conventional programs placed Indian people on a par with the majority population in the categories discussed in this chapter, it seems clear that many of the persons who have written about the education of Indians during the past ten years would not be satisfied. It is this aspect of the matter which will be discussed in the next chapter.

Chapter 4

SUGGESTED CAUSES OF THE EDUCATIONAL DISADVANTAGE

Acculturation vs. Biculturalism

A survey of the literature of the past ten years reveals general agreement that the Indian's educational deficits, as described in the preceding chapter, are serious -- indeed, to use the Senate Subcommittee's strong term, the situation is "tragic" (134). There seems to be a consensus that these educational deficits are holding up Indian advancement on all fronts. One senses, however, that there is not perfect agreement as to the causes of the Indian's educational disadvantage. Much of the commentary in this field has come from the social sciences, particularly anthropology and sociology, with the linguists also having an active voice. Relatively little input has come from practicing educators at the elementary and secondary school levels and, when practicing educators have spoken, it has usually been in the context of educational conferences or teacher-training sessions. There has been, then, no real confrontation of views about the education of Indians. What comes through in a reading of the literature is a difference of emphasis and perhaps of priorities. Both the social scientists and the educational practitioners seem to agree that Indian Americans must be helped to find a place in today's world which is satisfying to them while ensuring their right of self-determination and the dignification and preservation of Indian culture.

But one feels that the first priority of the school people is acculturation and of the social scientists the "Indian voice" and the dignification and preservation of the indigenous culture. Predictably, the Indians have little to say at all.

The report of the Senate Subcommittee (134), before finding both the public and Federal schools almost wholly lacking in their education of Indian children, passed a negative historical judgment on the Federal Government. The report said that the dominant policy of the Federal Government toward the American Indian had been one of coercive assimilation and that this policy had resulted in the destruction and disorganization of Indian communities and individuals; had set up a desperately severe and self-perpetuating cycle of poverty for most Indians; had exerted a strong negative influence on national attitudes; and had produced disastrous effects on the education of Indian children.

Gaarder (46), a linguist, cites Justice Brandeis to the effect that the primary right of the citizen is his individual self-fulfillment. Gaarder says that this takes precedence over preparation for citizenship, preparation for the "world of work," and assimilation into the "mainstream of American life." He claims that the practice in American Indian education has been squarely at odds with this and that "the de facto principle has been that the Indian's salvation lies in his ceasing to be what and who he is, that it lies in becoming assimilated by the acceptance of 'educative' procedures designed to alienate the child from his own people, beginning with the rule that English shall be the language of instruction."

He goes on: "The view taken in this paper is that the sole disadvantageous difference that matters is the extent of the Indian's lack of self-sufficiency and that self-sufficiency comes from self-fulfillment at every age level."

Woods (147) quotes Murray and Rosalie Wax, sociologist and anthropologist, respectively, as follows:

> Many people born as Indians have assimilated into the society about them, and this disappearance is usually regarded as a "success" by the administrative or benevolent agency that may have conspired to assist this process. Yet, there is by now some evidence to indicate that the effort to assimilate Indians, to integrate them into the white community and to dissolve their identity via the acids of education and retraining may in fact be contributing far more to the creation of a deracinated proletariat -- a faceless urban poor -- people without identity or hope. If this is so, those who are interested in assisting Indians to rise from poverty might well desist from their bureaucratic warfare against Indian communities and instead encourage Indians to organize in the forms of their own choice.

Parmee (100), an anthropologist, in a community study done on the San Carlos Apache Reservation, said that

> It is the intention of the author to show, by means of a small community study within the society of a minority American culture, how education, when used to impose culture change at a rate and of a nature that is defined solely by the convenience and ethnocentric policies of the dominant culture, can create serious social and psychological conflicts within the minority society. These conflicts can actually inhibit the very adjustment or change that the dominant culture is trying to promote. Furthermore, they can affect the potential human resources of the minority society in such a deleterious manner that the people are left morally weakened, culturally deprived, and economically dependent.

And Broderick Johnson (64), in an interpretation of the Rough Rock Demonstration School, has written:

> First, the Rough Rock Demonstration School is guided by the philosophy that the Indian can, and should, be educated to retain his identity with his native values and culture while, at the same time, learning to master the Anglo culture and to take his place in the Anglo world, if he so desires. Other schools established for the Indian have followed in the past the theory that he should be separated from his natural heritage, that he should forsake his culture and traditions in favor of the way of life of the dominant Anglo society. (Emphasis added.)

On the other hand, the Coleman Report (33) discussed minority ethnic groups in general. The Indian American was only one of several about which the following was said:

> The schools bear many responsibilities. Among the most important is the teaching of certain intellectual skills such as reading, writing, calculating, and problem solving. . . . These tests (which were used) do not measure intelligence, nor attitudes, nor qualities of character. Furthermore, they are not, nor are they intended to be, "culture free." Quite the reverse: they are culture bound. What they measure are the skills which are among the most important in our society for getting a good job and moving up to a better one, and for full participation in an increasingly technical world. Consequently, a pupil's test results at the end of public school provide a good measure of the range of opportunity open to him as he finishes school -- a wide range of choice of jobs or colleges if these skills are very high; a very narrow range that includes only the most menial jobs if these skills are very low.

At a conference on vocational education in August of 1969, Henry Wall (41), speaking for the BIA but probably representing the contemporary point of view of most educators of Indian children, said that he believed Indian people wanted the following things for themselves and their children: (1) the opportunity to go as far in school as their ability, interest, and effort will take them; (2) at the earliest possible time, parity with non-Indians in educational attainment both in terms of years and quality of their educational experience; and (3) full involvement of themselves and their communities in control of their children's schools. He pointed out, however, that there are constraints which complicate the reaching of these objectives by Indian people. Some of these are (1) that many Indian children must learn English as a second language; (2) that many Indian children, having grown up in geographic and dominant culture isolation, have never had experiences which middle-class non-Indian children take for granted; (3) that in order to bridge two cultures, the Indian child must be helped to understand cultural interrelationships and must be taught pride in his own cultural origins; and (4) that Indian people have not had an effective voice in management of their schools.

Cata (31) quotes Harriger, of the BIA curriculum development staff, as follows:

> The study of social sciences by Navajo children should lead them to understandings of how man, in whatever environmental setting, cooperates with his fellows in seeking a tenable lifeway - a good life. The social sciences should help him to see that man's adjustments to his environment are, for the most part, intelligent solutions to his problems and yearnings. Understanding that, the Navajo child can look with new insights at his own unique culture and the cultures about him. He can see the dignity and genius of the Navajo Way and at the same time he can compare that way with other, equally valid ways.

Teachers of Indian children, in a summer teacher workshop conducted by Potts and Sizemore (107) in 1964, considered the question of whether the school should "enculturate" the Indian child in the native culture or "acculturate" him to the dominant culture with due respect for the native culture. The workshop group decided that the demands of life require the latter. A group of papers prepared by teachers and reported on by Sizemore (122) reflects a generally strong adherence on the part of teachers to the idea that Indian children should be taught the values and skills of the dominant society, although there is expressed deference to Indian culture and expressed recognition that it must be taken into account in teaching.

Osborn (97), a specialist in communication, says that

> If we act on the premise that the American Indian student wishes to enter the dominant culture, that his school attendance at the secondary school level represents a commitment to participation in the affairs of the larger society, then it is the educator's responsibility to provide those skills, particularly in the area of language and communication, which will help the student to assume a productive role in today's world.

Young (150), a linguist with years of practical and responsible experience in working with and for Indian tribes, helps to mediate the acculturative and the bicultural emphases. He discusses the difference in point of view between the "borrower" and the "lender" in a cultural transaction -- the importance of the lender understanding the perceptions of the borrower and developing successful techniques in carrying out the transaction. He cites as an example the rapid introduction of Navajo children into public schools during the 1950's and the recognized need of the public schools for a better understanding of the problems. He comments: "In the latter case (induced acculturation) the degree of success and the quantity of time required hinge, to no small degree, on the depth of understanding acquired by the 'lender' and on the effectiveness of applied techniques."

Holland (60) says, "Some writers suggest that a goal for education should be the eventual absorption of these groups into the dominant Anglo culture. Others, however, strongly urge a bicultural viewpoint which would preserve ethnic identity while providing the necessary tools for educational, economic, and social achievement in American middle class society." Then, in a masterpiece of understatement, she concludes that "The line between cultural pluralism and total assimilation seems to be a difficult one to draw."

The Demand for Bicultural Education

At least 30 percent of the commentators on Indian education in recent years have made a major point of the need for bicultural education, and an equal number of commentators have at least referred to it. The references to this need, in fact, have been so repetitive as to have taken on a kind of liturgical effect. Mainly, the call has been for a greater awareness and understanding of cultural differences, and a greater respect for Indian culture, on the part of the people who work with Indian children. There also has been a demand for more and better-chosen Indian materials in the curriculum. Several investigators are convinced that most, or at least a good part, of the Indian student's scholastic difficulties stem from his alienation from the dominant society or from the school itself.

Cultural Differences

Zintz (152)(88), Poehlman (104)(105), Pratt (108), Sizemore (121) (122), Hinckley (58), Kelly (50), Lopez (72), Salisbury (115), Stone (127), Bryde (23), Nix (89), Osborn (97), Steere (126), and Ulibarri (132) have all attempted to contribute to an understanding of the cultural values or traits which distinguish Indian people from those in the dominant culture.

Nix (89) and a group of workers in Indian education, meeting in a summer workshop at Arizona State University in 1962, attempted to compile a list of such differences. They noted that, in general, Indian people tend to differ from people in the dominant society in the following ways: (1) they are less conscious (compulsive) of time; (2) they have closer interpersonal relationships; (3) they set less value on property rights; (4) their society is cooperative rather than competitive; (5) they are reticent rather than articulate; (6) they are less habituated to a work schedule; (7) they are less concerned about saving for the future; (8) they value placidity and are slow to anger; (9) they seek harmony with nature rather than control; (10) they reject a scientific explanation of the cosmos in favor of a supernatural one; (11) they honor age over youth; (12) illegitimacy bears no stigma; (13) they have a low ego level and strive for anonymity; and (14) they are more at home with the concrete than the abstract.

Sizemore (121) added to this list a tendency toward an immediate, rather than postponed, gratification of desires. Poehlman (104) counseled teachers not to be too aggressive in their style of teaching and not to be too effusive in their praise of Indian students. Poehlman (105) also noted that it is not considered polite in Indian society for a child to look an adult in the eye; that it is not usual in the Indian culture to volunteer advice and consequently that teachers might do better to withhold advice until it is asked for; and that there is greater permissiveness in the parent-child relationship in Indian than in white culture.

Kelly (50) says that Indian adults lower rather than raise their voices when correcting a child; that sharing and generosity are prime virtues; that since Indian children are sometimes disciplined by ridicule in the native culture, they fear making a mistake if they are not prepared adequately; and that they learn by observing and consider good behavior and skillful work as no more than "human nature" which does not call for special praise.

Lopez (72) cites the Indian student's lack of competitiveness and differing concept of time, and Stone (127) mentions the Indian's time orientation to the present (a recurring theme) and his strong feeling that sharing is a virtue. Hinckley (58) counsels those working with Indian community groups to be aware of the power structure -- the real leader may be a "longhair" who is silent but gives approval by his presence or withholds it by his absence -- or to recognize that a particular Indian society may be matrilineal whereas whites tend to expect men to take the lead.

Salisbury (115) quotes Seymour Parker, an anthropologist, as saying that the Alaskan native often has difficulty verbalizing and communicating his subjective reaction to situations. When something is bothering him, he may have trouble telling his peers or even members of his family. Stone (127) expresses the belief that the Indian child is different from the non-Indian child "even if he comes from similar economic brackets or geographic areas." She quotes a report of the National Congress of American Indians: "While the Nation's attention is focused on the battle for Negro civil rights, the Native American Indian is waging his own independence struggle in reverse - the Indian is fighting to remain a separate and distinct race."

Zintz (153), also stressing the need to understand cultural differences but showing the other side of the coin, lists certain values in the dominant culture which we expect the Indian school child to learn: (1) he must climb the ladder of success, and in order to do this he must place a high value on competitive achievement; (2) he must learn time orientation that will be precise to the hour and the minute, and he must also learn to place a high value on looking into the future; (3) he must accept the teacher's reiteration that there is a scientific explanation for all natural phenomena; (4) he must become accustomed to change and must anticipate change (The dominant culture teaches that "change," in and of itself, is desirable!); (5) he must trade his shy, quiet, reserved, and anonymous behavior for socially approved, aggressive, competitive behavior; (6) he must somehow be brought to understand that he can, with some independence, shape his own destiny, as opposed to the tradition of remaining an anonymous member of his society.

Simpson (120) put it less delicately and perhaps less sympathetically. Reporting on his evaluation of compensatory education programs in 1967, he recommended five remedial steps, one of which was to train Indian students in the values of the major culture as well as in technical skills. Simpson added that "Great emphasis must be placed on the inculcation of the individual values on which our society depends."

Woods and Harkins (148), though extremely sympathetic to the problems of Indian people in cultural transition, note that, in Minneapolis, "For that portion of the Indian population accepting the standards, customs, and traditions of 'white America,' employment presents no real problems."

Alienation

Probably few qualified observers doubt that the adjustment to a new culture can put an emotional strain on the Indian youth, perhaps a most severe one. Salisbury (115) observes that if the native youth of Alaska sees no relevance in the school program to his home and community, he may come to feel that his own language is inferior and he may become alienated from his home and community. Osborn (97) states that an Indian student adapts to a competitive, argumentative, and highly verbal world at some risk of severe personality disorientation. And McKinley (80) reports that on his reservation the teacher found that, when her class engaged in role playing, nearly all of the pupils of both sexes wanted to be women because of the greatly diminished role of the male in tribal life. This discovery induced the tribe to embark on a leadership and management training program for men.

Vontress (136) cautioned counselors of Indian students that they should have a broad understanding of cultural differences, else their counseling might alienate the people they are counseling. Miller (83) found Indian students more alienated than white students. And Harkins (55), in a study of a Minnesota Chippewa community, reported "an early detachment from the teacher on the part of Indian children. Teachers do not tend to be seen as persons assisting in the schooling process...but seem to be viewed from a vast social distance."

However, the leading proponents of the theory that the main cause of the Indian student's educational troubles is cultural alienation are John Bryde and Murray and Rosalie Wax.

Bryde (22)(23), noting the high dropout rate and progressive achievement deficit of Sioux students, hypothesized that the conflict between

Sioux values and those in the dominant society, particularly as evidenced in the school and classroom, sets up personality stress with many students. The problem goes beyond value clashes to be a problem of self-identification. Bryde set up the following four hypotheses:

I. That Sioux children will exceed the national norm on achievement tests through the sixth grade and then decline.

II. That, at the age of adolescence, there will be evidence of severe personality deviations and emotional problems.

III. That these deviations will correlate directly with degree of Indian blood.

IV. That individual personality scores of dropouts will be lower than those of students who stay in school.

Bryde then tested his hypotheses by use of achievement tests and the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. As a result of the tests, Bryde accepted his first and second hypotheses, although he found that the evidence was less clear at the twelfth-grade level, probably because of the high percentage of students who had already dropped out. On the third hypothesis, of 28 comparisons, 5 were significant at the .05 level of confidence and 6 at the .10 level of confidence, all showing greater alienation among those students with more Indian blood. Concerning the fourth hypothesis, of 33 comparisons between dropouts and stayins, 11 were statistically significant, all in favor of stayins. Significant differences between Indian and white students were found on 26 of 28 variables. Most notable were greater feelings of rejection, depression, anxiety, and tendencies to withdraw on the part of the Indian students, plus social, self-, and emotional alienation. Bryde also found that dropouts were more alienated than twelfth graders on 23 of 28 comparisons, and his proposed remedy for this situation will be described in the following chapter.

Murray Wax (139) believes that the principal cause of school failure is a difference of norms and values between the school and the home, causing cultural disharmony between the two and a loss of cultural identity on the part of the student. Wax further hypothesizes that the lack of control of Indians over their schools and insufficient information about careers open to students both on and off the reservation are contributing causes of school dropout or failure. He does not believe that technical inadequacy on the part of the school is the main problem.

Rosalie Wax (143) states that many dropouts are really "pushouts" or "kickouts." She also reports that the loyalty of Sioux boys is to their peers and not their teachers. She says, "We marveled at the variety and efficiency of the devices developed by Indian children to frustrate formal learning -- unanimous inattention, refusal to go to the board, writing on the board in letters less than an inch high, inarticulate responses and whispered or pantomime teasing of victims called on to recite." In spite of this, she says that most Sioux children insist that they like school and most parents corroborate this, but it is because of the social rewards and not the learning.

In a study of Indian dropouts at the secondary level, Murray and Rosalie Wax (141) found a strong correlation between dropout and poverty. They reported that a large proportion of families of dropouts were categorized as extremely poor, even by "country" Indian standards. Children from such homes had almost no chance of finishing high school -- about half of them did not even try to enroll. It was also noted that the qualitative relationship between the child and his parents or guardians was more important than the quantitative. In addition, young people who spoke scarcely any English rarely enrolled in high school; on the other hand, proficiency in the English language was no guarantee of high school graduation. Most surprising of all was the finding that the majority of of country Indian day school students learned to speak English moderately well if they attended the school for any length of time.

Self-concept

Related to the matter of alienation, perhaps, is the self-concept of the Indian student, about which a good deal has been said. The chairman of the Senate Subcommittee (134) has written: "Indian children, more than any other minority group, believe themselves to be below average in intelligence." While technically correct, this amounts to a rather serious distortion. A close reading of the Coleman tables (33) shows that only 8 percent of the Indian students in the study believed that they were below average in brightness, as compared with 7 percent of the Mexican American students. A mere 2 percent thought they were "among the lowest," compared with 3 percent of Mexican Americans. The same table shows that 11 percent of the Indian students thought they were "among the brightest," compared with 8 percent of the Mexican American students. Actually, there is little difference among Indian, Mexican American, and Puerto Rican students regarding this or the other self-concept questions.

Coleman has this to say about self-concept:

> In general, the responses to these questions do not indicate differences between Negroes and whites, but do indicate differences between them and the other minority groups. Negroes and whites show similar levels of response to these items, . . . Each of the other groups shows lower self-concept on each of these questions than does either the Negro sample or the white sample. It is puzzling to some analysts that the Negro children report levels of self-esteem as high as whites when there is so much in their social environment to reduce the self-esteem of a Negro, and those analysts conjecture that these responses may not mean what their face value suggests.

Later, Coleman says that

> For each group, as the proportion white in the school increases, the child's sense of control of environment increases, and his self-concept decreases. This suggests the possibility that school integration has conflicting effects on attitudes of minority group children: it increases their sense of control of the environment or their sense of opportunity, but decreases their self-concept.

Significantly, the Coleman data show that the Indian Americans were the "most integrated" of any minority group; 60 percent of the elementary

2

pupils and 70 percent of the secondary pupils with whom they went to school were white.

There are other studies which tend to support the Coleman point of view. Bass (10), in the ongoing study of Indian high school students, administered a semantic differential. He discovered that, of ten variables, the concept MYSELF AS A PERSON was second from the bottom, although even so the Indian students averaged in the "neutral" or "slightly positive" range. Bass reported, however, that "Apparently Indian students were quite optimistic about their future, since they rated the concept, MY FUTURE, fourth highest on the Cognitive Evaluation factor and third highest on each of the others." They tended to rate EDUCATION, SCHOOL, and COLLEGE highest of all.

Finally, Selinger (116) found that more than one-half of the high school graduates he interviewed felt that they had succeeded or were on their way to doing so, and Bass (8) found that three-fourths of the Indian high school graduates in the Southwest felt that they had succeeded or at least had been partially successful.

In all of this consideration of self-concept, no one seems to have noted that it has been pointed out repeatedly that self-deprecation of one's importance as an individual is a part of Indian culture.

There seems to be enough contradictory evidence concerning the self-concept of Indian students to require that the matter be probed much more deeply than has been the case thus far.

Bicultural Learning Materials

A great deal has been written and said about the inappropriateness of conventional learning materials for use in the Indian classroom. Dick and Jane are the names of two youngsters who are the principal characters in the primary-level basal readers of a leading schoolbook publishing house. The characters are blond and blue eyed, live in a very typical suburban neighborhood in the United States, and are members of a very typical middle-class family. It is probable that the creators of Dick and Jane little suspected that those names would become terms of opprobrium, symbolizing all that is wrong with teaching materials in the education of minority group children.

Salisbury (115) says that by age 7, when the Eskimo child's cultural pattern is set, he enters an alien Western classroom and encounters Dick and Jane. The child is then expected to learn about all of these strange people, doing incomprehensibly strange things, using the English language. Salisbury states that "The native child continues to learn this new language which is of no earthly use to him at home and which seems completely unrelated to the world of sky, birds, snow, ice, and tundra which he sees around him."

Groesbeck (53), proposing a supplemental reading program for Indian children, pointed out that they have had few experiences which prepare them for the basal readers. She says they face three stages of transition: (a) from expression and reception of thought in the native tongue to the same process in American English, (b) from the newly learned language signals to graphic signs for the same language signals, and (c) from familiar ideational and cultural patterns of thought to those of new and different people portrayed in the basic texts. Groesbeck's purpose was to provide in her materials characters and experiences with which the Indian youngster could identify, although she made clear that her materials would supplement and not replace the basal reading program. She pointed out, further, that many teachers were already devising such materials in their own classrooms.

Young (150), after discoursing on acculturation as a cultural transaction, said that "The overview provided in the foregoing pages points to the need for, and provides a framework for, the development of special materials, special instructional techniques, and special teacher training, all closely adapted to meet the peculiar problems of the Navajo learner. . . ."

Parmee (100), in his study of the San Carlos Apache Reservation, reported that Apache history and culture were ofttimes denigrated in the schools. Potts and Sizemore and their students (107) pointed out the need for Indian-oriented teaching materials in such fields as social studies, arithmetic, and science. Bryde (22) saw specially prepared cultural materials as the best antidote for the social alienation of Sioux students.

The Ad Hoc Committee on California Indian Education (44) called for the introduction of instructional materials which would recognize and honor the Indian heritage, both in the public schools and in the colleges, and said that both Indians and non-Indians would be enriched. Woods (147) found that the curriculum content on Indians needed improvement and updating in the public schools of Minneapolis and said that some progress was being made.

In 1967, public school representatives meeting at Mesa, Arizona, agreed that they should put more Indian cultural material in the curriculum (106). Also, the Ninth Annual American Indian Education Conference meeting at Tempe, Arizona, in 1968 endorsed the adoption of texts stressing Indian culture (3).

The Demand for Bilingual Education

There is wide agreement among both linguists and teachers that learning English is an important part of the Indian student's education. The disagreement, as we shall see, is about the best approach to doing it. Ohannessian (93), in studying the problems of teaching English to Indians, said that "At present the education of the Indian student depends to a very great degree on how efficiently he is taught English and how well he is able to learn it. Since all his other subjects will have to be learned through its medium, in a sense all his teachers are teachers of English."

Coombs (36), reporting on a study of 14,000 Indian students in 1958, noted that

> Investigation of the data reveals an amazingly consistent relationship between the degree of Indian blood and pre-school language on

> the one hand and level of achievement on the other. With only one exception, the smaller the amount of Indian blood in a group and the greater the amount of English spoken prior to school entrance, the higher the group achieved. Stating it another way, the higher achieving race-school groups contained fewer full-blood pupils and more pupils who spoke only English, or at least a combination of English and some other language, prior to school entrance.

There are a great many Indian students entering school each year for whom English is not their first language. Lamberts _et al_. (68) said,

> English is taught as a second language to children in schools administered by the BIA, public, and mission. An estimated 108 thousand Indians live in non-English speaking homes. Of the 45 thousand Indian children in Federal elementary and secondary schools, an estimated 80 percent come from full blood families where English is not the native language.

The percentage estimate by Lamberts _et al_. may be high as an overall figure, although it certainly is not too high for the Navajo and perhaps some other tribes in the Southwest. Bass (9), in studying 2,500 Indian high school students in a seven-state area, found that almost exactly two-thirds of them said that in their homes English was _not_ the normal language of communication. Coombs' study found a similar percentage, although noting a wide difference in percentage among different parts of the country as did the study by Bass.

In 1960, Zintz (152) listed a program for teaching English as a second language to be one of the most pressing problems in Indian education, and Poehlman (104) enjoined teachers to remember that many Indian children come to school with a poor command of English. Potts and Sizemore (107), in a teacher workshop held in 1964, offered practical hints in teaching English as a second language.

Bass and Burger (11) named the improvement of bilingual skills as one of the principal responsibilities of the Southwestern Laboratory. In addition, the theme of the 1961 Annual Conference on Navajo Education was the teaching of English to Navajo children as a second language. And Zintz (153) noted that "The linguistics of English language can be discussed meaningfully _only_ in the context of the cultural values, practices, attitudes, and ideals which are expressed through language. Language is oral. It is speech before it is reading or writing."

These rather routine and predictable reactions to an obvious problem do not comprise the crux of the matter, however. In June of 1967, the Subcommittee on Education of the House of Representatives held hearings on the Bilingual Education Act. At that time, the Commissioner of Education, Harold Howe (62), testified as follows:

> Let me observe also in response to something Mr. Scheuer said earlier in the hearing, I was very interested that he made the point that the melting pot is no longer the image of the United States in regard to groups coming from other cultures. I would like to second that point, and put another image in the picture, if I may: perhaps a better image than the melting pot. It is the image of the mosaic, which gains its strength from the variety.

Later in the hearing, he said, "A small child entering a school which appears to reject the only words he can use is adversely affected in every aspect of his being. He is immediately retarded in his school work."

Gaarder (47), testifying at the same hearing, put the point even more strongly:

> Every child is harmed if he loses full use of his mother tongue.

> . . . Every such child is in some measure harmed. Now let us consider a child such as the Spanish American or Puerto Rican. He is not only cheated of his language but he is damaged scholastically. . . . When you come to the Indian child, given what seems to be the fact that he cherishes his Indian status to a remarkable extent, and given the fact that his cultural patterns are markedly different from those of the dominant American group, hs is not simply cheated out of a language that does not matter internationally anyway, he is not just damaged in school: he is almost destroyed. As a matter of fact, historically, that is what we tried to do with them: destroy them. All you have to do is read the accounts to know that.

Ohannessian (93) commented:

> The...(assumption) is that at present a better understanding of linguistic and cultural relativity, among other factors, has resulted in a greater respect for and sympathy towards the language and cultural heritage of minority groups in the United States. It must be stated again that Indians are not immigrants to this country, the setting of their cultural heritage is still where they live today, and their problems are not the same as those of immigrant groups.

In making recommendations for the launching of a bilingual kindergarten program, Ohannessian reported: "There was general agreement with the policy that most kindergarten activities should be conducted in the language of the child at the start of the program."

Gaarder (47) made a further distinction, however:

> Now we come to bilingual education, a term which is not too widely understood. It is not simply teaching English as a second language, although English must necessarily be taught and necessarily as a second language because the child already has a first language. Bilingual education is the use of two language mediums to teach any part or all of the school curriculum except the languages themselves. In any bilingual education program we would hope that English would be taught better than it usually is to non-native speakers. English could indeed be taught much better.

Werner (42), in writing an evaluation of the Rough Rock Demonstration School, made the same point:

> A bilingual school is a school which uses, concurrently, two languages as medium of instruction in any portion of the curriculum (except the languages themselves). The teaching of a vernacular solely as a bridge to another, the official language, is *not* bilingual education in the above sense, nor is ordinary Teaching English as a second Language.

It may be of interest to note that when Selinger (116) and Bass (8) asked high school graduates whether they thought it was important to Indian students to be able to speak their native tongues, 85 percent of the southwestern students and two-thirds of the northwestern and north central students thought that it was. A majority of both groups, however, thought it was important only as a means of communicating, especially with older members of the tribe. Only one-third or less thought it was important as a means of preserving Indian culture or heritage.

The Demand for a Special Kind of Teacher

Only "biculturalism" ranks with "the teacher" as a focus of concern with those who write about Indian education. And no subject brings out more strident outcries from those who are most critical. If Dick and Jane are middle-class, the teacher is even more so. Even worse, many teachers are suspected of having *lower* middle-class origins, which means that they may have been through a struggle for upward mobility which has desensitized them to the problems of the poor and the culturally different.

Greenburg and Greenburg (50) urge the teacher to develop insights and understandings and recognize the Indian child's individuality -- to "modify his own middle class value system." Bass and Burger (11) report that one of the programs of the Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory has been "to improve psycho-social or cultural sensitivity toward those factors in Indian culture which may be at variance with the culture of the prevalent middle class school." Zintz (88) verbalizes the problem: "How can we become adequately informed about the effect of cultural differences between the middle class Anglo teacher and the Navajo children she teaches?"

Harkins (55), in beginning his study of a Chippewa community, took as one of his hypotheses that "Educators are ignorant of the cultural peculiarities and domestic existence of their village Indian pupils and interpret their behavior from within their own cultural framework, thus regarding their pupils as 'culturally deprived.'" (This, incidentally, is a phrase first popularized by Frank Riessman, apparently, in The Culturally Deprived Child, and the term has been used by several writers mentioned in the present report. "Culturally deprived" is offensive to many social scientists, however, because it suggests some inadequacy in the indigenous culture, and most scientists from other disciplines have learned not to use it.) McKinley (80) coined the term "discrimination without prejudice" and said that the teacher often views the Indian child through middle-class eyes and "writes him off."

Zintz (152) commented on the many problems which Indian children experience in adapting to a new culture and noted that teachers need to be sensitive to these problems. He predicted that teachers would be if their involvement were "cooperatively enlisted." McGrath (78) contended that colleges have a special obligation to help Indian students identify and solve their cultural problems; in addition, it was mentioned that colleges should help teachers and counselors attain a better understanding of the Indian culture.

Young (150), Osborn (97), Simpson (120), Poehlman (105)(104), Pratt (108), and Sizemore (121) all stress the need for teachers and others who work with Indian youngsters to become "sensitized" to their problems and sympathetically aware of their culture.

Ortiz (96), evaluating a Head Start program in an Indian community, said that the people wanted teachers interested in their children who would have special training for teaching Indian children. He noted that Arizona State University provides such training. Forbes (44), reporting for the Ad Hoc Committee on California Indian Education, records that a conference held in 1967 recommended that teachers familiarize themselves with Indian culture and values, develop a respect for it, learn at least some common words of the language, and "critically examine their own middle class assumptions." Ulibarri and Holeman (133) comment that the administrator in a bilingual, bicultural community must "act with caution, forebearance, and great understanding, paying intense heed to his community."

There has been other interesting evidence of concern about producing a special kind of teacher for Indian children. Lopez (72) relates that when Santo Domingo, San Felipe, and Cochiti children were sent to a public school in 1956 the people were promised that the "cultural and local needs of the pupils and the pueblos would be met by the educational program." In fulfillment of that promise, each year an orientation program is carried out for instructional staff members, most of whom were reared in a culture different from that of their pupils. The idea is to help teachers with "culture shock" and to prepare them better for the particular teaching job they face.

Buckley (24), in a report on economic and social development done by the Centre for Community Studies for the Department of Natural Resources of the Province of Saskatchewan, recommended that the Department of Education continue to raise the qualifications of northern teachers (of Indian and Metis students) by supporting special training courses and by providing higher salaries and increments for qualified personnel. It was also recommended that adequate guidance and counseling services be provided for the northern school age population, both in and out of school.

Oklahoma State University (94), in 1968, reported on a project carried out at the request of the BIA Chilocco School which, among other things, was designed to identify student teachers interested in teaching disadvantaged Indian students and encouraging them to make school visits. The univeristy also established an eight-week accredited summer program at Chilocco, aimed at involving student teachers with the Indian students. In addition, Northern Montana College has proposed a project to be carried out under the Educational Professions Development Act which would provide for the training of fifteen graduate teachers and fifteen undergraduate teacher aides to "perform highly specialized roles in the education of Indian children" in the Havre district.

Miller (84), in reporting on an institute for training teachers for teaching English as a second language said that only two of thirty-six participants had any previous training in the field. Many had never heard of such training until the announcement of the institute was released. Of the thirty-six participants, twenty had an Indian enrollment of from 95 to 100 percent in their schools.

Anderson and Safar (144), studying the influence of differential community perceptions in two New Mexico multicultural communities, found in Community A that the school board, school administration, and all but a few teachers were Anglo; in Community B, the school superintendent was Spanish American but the other administrators and most of the sixty-three teachers were Anglo. It was reported that "In both communities (including teachers) there is an almost unanimous feeling that Spanish-American and Indian children are less capable of achieving desirable goals and ultimately becoming productive members of society than are their Anglo contemporaries."

Silvaroli and Zuchowski (119) have reported on the Fort Thomas Diverse Capacity Project. Fort Thomas is a public school in which 85 percent of the enrollment is made up of Apache students from the San Carlos Reservation. One of the goals of the project was the improvement of faculty understanding regarding the differences between Indian and Anglo culture. The first year's program indicated considerable need for teacher change -- those teachers with greater professionalism were most willing to change. The final report indicated that some secure teachers changed but those who were insecure did not. The investigators concluded that it is relatively impossible to change human behavior in the affective domain and therefore it was suggested that teachers be sought who possess the understanding necessary to teach all children.

As usual, teachers get some of their most severe criticism from the anthropologists, not all of it very well documented. Anne Smith (41) charges discrimination in the schools against the Indian and says that the answer lies in educators learning to respect cultural pluralism. Murray Wax (140), in a study of the Cherokee in eastern Oklahoma, alleges that the education of the Tribal Cherokee is in the hands of educators who are "ignorant of and indifferent to their language, values, and cultural traditions, and because the curriculum contains no provisions for assisting children of Tribal Cherokee background, these pupils derive very little from their years at school." Wax also notes that Tribal Cherokee parents are "critical of the educators for abusing their children and of the schools for failing to educate them." (Emphasis added.)

Salisbury (114) states that, until fairly recently, people in authority in Alaskan native villages -- such as missionaries, teachers, and construction foremen -- have regarded their role to be parental and that native adults have been content to assume a dependency role.

Parmee (100), in his study of the San Carlos Apache community, found that much of the teaching in the elementary program in the BIA school on the reservation was of low quality. He reported a lack of understanding of Indian students and their culture on the part of all teachers and provided some quotes to back up his contention. One public school counselor was quoted as saying, "Apaches are at the bottom of the barrel as far as Indians go. They are the dumbest and worst off economically. They don't want to be educated and they don't want to get out from under the government." A reservation school principal gave his opinion: "The trouble is these (Apache) people don't want education. They think it's poison. They hold ceremonies every year to do away with all the evils their kids have picked up in school!"

Harkins (55) has this to say about the attitudes of the public school teachers of Chippewa children in a Minnesota community:

> These Blue Pine teachers reveal by their overall responses . . . an uneven, general sensitivity to Indian differences, but usually only the "negative" ones. . . . Apparently the teachers do not appear to hate the children or to fear them for their differences. . . their negative references to family life styles are no more virulent than many materials generated by intellectuals engaged in the broad field of anti-poverty theory and action. These teachers are Minnesotans, apparently, above anything else. . . .
>
> A significant factor associated with the dynamics of Blue Pine Reservation schools has been the persistent tendency of white educators to overwhelmingly deny the value of Indian culture in the classroom, and in the next ideological breath to praise the notion of positive individual attention to "different" or

> "culturally deprived" children. But even the casual observer quickly learns that school personnel have little time or appropriate training for individual attention to uncooperative or different white children, let alone for Indian children with an alien cultural heritage.

To all of these charges, the teachers make no rejoinder in the literature, whether because they are unaware of the charges or agree with them (which does not seem likely), or because they do not feel that they have at their disposal appropriate channels for presenting their defense. Occasionally, someone speaks up for the teacher. Cata (31) notes that the staff of the University of New Mexico, which was developing social studies material for the BIA, "found more 'know how' among teachers than they gave themselves credit for and much enthusiasm."

Gardner (49), who studied three hundred teachers of Indian pupils with a semantic differential instrument, concluded:

> The educators sampled in this study tend to have a generally favorable stereotype concerning Indian students. . . .Their expectation is that he is intelligent and friendly. . . .The implications for teaching seem clear. The educators generally have a healthy respect for their charges. One would imagine that they experience reward with their task.

Central Washington State College (*), during its workshop for BIA teachers and guidance personnel in the summer of 1968, found that on an Attitudes Toward Indians scale both non-Indian and Indian teachers displayed positive or favorable feelings toward Indians.

The reference in the Senate Subcommittee report (134) to the effect that one-fourth of the teachers surveyed would prefer not to be teaching Indian children does not appear so ominous when one takes the trouble to read the Coleman Report from which the statement was taken. All teachers were asked whether they would prefer to teach white children, and about one-fourth of the teachers of Indian children said that they would (almost exactly the same percentage as for the teachers of Mexican American students) compared with more than one-third of the teachers of white children. Taken as a group, this shows some positive orientation of the teachers of Indian children toward their pupils. What appears to the present writer to be more disturbing is that only 57 percent of the teachers of Indian children believed that compensatory programs of education for them were necessary and desirable.

Perhaps Moynihan (85) provides some solace to middle-class teachers: "Social scientists love poor people. They also get along fine with rich people. . . . But, alas, they do not have much time for the people in between."

In addition, the Director of Indian Education for the State of New Mexico did speak his mind in his 1967 report (98):

> Those who expound a rigid concept of cultural differences continue to arrange groups of people into various selected categories, ignore the similarities among human beings, condemn the so-called middle class values, while claiming personal sanctuary in their embrace of such values.
>
> It is our belief that similarities among people constitute the day-by-day working relationships and that middle class values have generally provided democratic representation in government, national vigor and genuine interest in the common welfare. The problem seems to be one of helping people to attain and preserve middle class values while retaining their individual identities.

It has been noted often that few Indian children have Indian teachers. There are some references in the literature to a need for more Indian teachers, but the number of these references is not overwhelming. The Ad Hoc Committee on California Indian Education (44) strongly urged school boards and school administrators to make every effort to hire teachers of Indian ancestry. And according to Woods (147), the school people of Minneapolis said that, although they were trying to hire Indian teachers and other employees, such employees are hard to find. Lekanof (70) suggested that local people could teach at the preschool level in the Alaskan villages and advocated training programs for native teacher aides, as well as for teachers' assistants and teachers' associates (by which he apparently means native paraprofessionals who might eventually attain full professional status).

On the other hand, although saying that the teacher of bilingual education should be bilingual, Ulibarri (132) cautioned that teachers in the bilingual program should have the same types of qualifications as are required by certification laws. He feels that it would be fallacious to assume that paraprofessionals who do not have much training in educational theory, child growth and development, and subject matter areas would be good teachers. Harkins and Woods (56), who questioned 135 Indian youths in Minneapolis, found that 60 percent thought it would help if their teachers knew more about Indians; however, less than one-fourth of them were interested in becoming teachers themselves.

Sizemore (121) advocated the training of more Indian teacher aides, and Thomas (130) described a Navajo public school program where this was being done.

The total number of teachers of Indian ancestry in the country is not known. The Senate Subcommittee cites the Coleman Report to the effect that only 1 percent of Indian children have Indian teachers. It is certainly "straining at a gnat" to point out that the figure at the secondary level is actually 2 percent, and there is no comfort in the fact that the Mexican American and the Puerto Rican children are in almost the same situation as the Indian children.

Martin (19) reported in 1962 that, of 74 classroom teachers in the Window Rock Public School, 8 were Navajo.

In 1968, the BIA (*) surveyed its instructional, administrative-supervisory, and instructional aide personnel. It was found that, of nearly 2,300 professional teachers, 16 percent were of Indian descent. (The preponderance of pupils in the Coleman study were in public schools.) Of 433 administrative and supervisory persons, nearly 27 percent were of Indian ancestry and, of more than 1,600 instructional aides (guidance as well as classroom), more than 92 percent were Indian.

In the BIA study, 53 percent of the teachers were 39 years of age or younger, with 20-29 being the modal age group. More than 92 percent of the teachers held the baccalaureate or some higher degree, and an even 20 percent had attained the master's degree. There were indications from the age and tenure figures that the greatest turnover of teachers occurs on the Navajo Reservation and in Alaska, the most isolated areas in which the BIA operates. While better teacher turnover data should become available from a study now in progress, the BIA estimates turnover to be on the order of 25 percent a year, with 40 percent of those who do leave doing so in the first year. Each year, the BIA must recruit approximately 600 teacher replacements, most of whom have had no special training for teaching Indian children.

Davey *et al*. (38) reported that the percentage of teacher turnover in the Federal Indian schools of Canada for the 1963-64 school year was 29 percent. Federal teachers in Canada, as in the United States, are civil service employees, a fact which presents some complications in securing a "special kind of teacher" for Indian pupils, as will be discussed in greater detail later. Lekanof (70) believes that the training and hiring of native teachers would greatly reduce the turnover rate in Alaska.

Whether or not the critics are too severe in their allegations that the teachers of Indian children do not hold them and their culture in sufficient regard, it may be that at least things are no worse than in the past. Haglund (54) gives a verbatim quotation from the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of Nevada in the early 1930's:

> The Indian will never develop into much more than a very mediocre American citizen. . . . It is our belief that

> Indian children should be provided with only such fundamental teachings as will fit them to make a living of a decent sort, through the use of simple tools, the simple elements of farming, cattle raising, gardening, washing, ironing, cooking, sewing, etc.

It is encouraging to note that, today, 67 percent of Nevada's Indian youths are finishing high school (99).

The Demand for an Indian Voice

The fourth and final key demand which appears in the literature is for what may be called an effective "Indian voice." By mentioning it last, there is no intention to imply that the advocates of reform in Indian education consider it less important than the other demands which have been listed. Indeed, it is seen as a means of ensuring realization of the other demands. The definition of an Indian voice varies rather widely, ranging from a greater understanding of the program of the school to complete responsibility for its operation. Increasingly, however, an effective Indian voice has come to mean effective control of the decision-making process and not merely an advisory or consultative role.

Many commentators find both the public and the Federal schools remiss in this regard. There are certain built-in obstacles to full Indian control of the schools which serve their children -- for example, the peculiar status of the BIA as an agency of the Federal Government, or the diffusion of Indian influence in an integrated public school in which Indians are a minority. The social scientists, however, typically see the lack of an Indian voice as being the result of the insensitivity or outright hostility of the non-Indian power structure.

Sizemore (121), in a summary of the teacher workshop she conducted in 1967, noted that the Indian community should be included in planning of the school program and that, generally, the Indian must be involved in the solution of his problems.

Owens (98) called for the inclusion of more qualified Indian citizens on public school boards, and the 1961 Annual Conference on Navajo Education (88) recommended that the school be community-centered and that it include parents in the learning process. In addition, the National Association for the Education of Young Children (86), while planning a kindergarten curriculum guide, stressed the importance of parental and community involvement in developing the kindergarten program so that a better understanding of the program would evolve.

Smith (124) mentioned that schools enrolling Indian children should encourage parental involvement but also maintained that the BIA has been paternalistic in not letting Indians make decisions (125).

The report of the Senate Subcommittee on Indian Education (134) is almost wholly condemnatory of both the public schools and the BIA. Of the public schools, it says that

> American Indians have little, if any, influence or control in the education of their children in the public schools. Indian membership on school boards which have jurisdiction in districts educating Indians is rare. The white power structure often thwarts Indian attempts to gain representation on school boards.

Of the BIA, the report has this to say:

> Indian parents and communities have practically no control over the BIA schools educating their children. The white man's school often sits in a compound completely alien to the community it supposedly serves. It does not serve as a community resource nor does it recognize community needs or desires.

In 1965, a survey team representing the Commissioner of Indian Affairs studied the Navajo Bordertown Dormitory Program, an arrangement wherein several thousand Navajo adolescents live in BIA-operated dormitories and attend public schools in eight communities adjacent to the Navajo Reservation. A report which the commissioner delivered to the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee (34) said, in part:

> The survey team believes that the long range solution to providing a high school education for increasing numbers of Navajo students lies in the development of the reservation public school system. This is important for the following reasons: . . .
>
> 2. Reservation public school districts are accountable to Navajo citizens who live within their borders. . . . Navajo parents and other adults who reside within the boundaries of organized school districts have, and exercise, the right to vote for school board members and to serve on school boards. All five of the public school districts on the reservation which were visited by the team had one or more Navajo members serving on the school board; in one district all five members were Navajo.

Harkins (55) hypothesized, at the outset of a study of a Chippewa community in Minnesota, that "Village Indian school board members know little about school board functions and thus serve mainly to legitimize what public authorities do." He reported, however, that his data did not deal adequately with the hypothesis.

Stone (127), in an article in the Journal of American Indian Education, claims that the government has deliberately broken up the old power structures to make the tribes more amenable to its wishes. One of Roessel's students (113) at a summer workshop on community development, in proposing a project for the Bylas community on the San Carlos Apache Reservation, reported that the people had no part in planning many of the efforts made in the past and that "There has been a pattern of paternalistic leadership by government staff and Apache leaders." (Emphasis added.)

Woods (147), studying Indian Americans in Minneapolis, found that "almost half said they had never voted in a public election and almost as many had never voted in a reservation election." Nevertheless, he found evidence that Indians are interested in education. Three Indians were presidents of parent-school groups, two were chairmen of PTA groups, and one was president of his Home and School Association.

Ortiz (96), studying a Head Start program in an Indian community, found that non-Tewa members of the community had not only made use of English a necessity but also had created a leadership vacuum and increased the difficulty of the community making meaningful choices.

There are two references which shed some light on relations between the new "poverty" programs and the longer established agencies. Simpson (120), writing of compensatory education programs in nine public school districts, pointed out that one of the guidelines promulgated by the U.S. Office of Education read as follows:

> In any area where a Community Action Program under Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is in effect, any project under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act must be developed in cooperation with the public or non-profit agency responsible for the Community Action Program.

And Bee (13), evaluating the feasibility of a Head Start program on an Indian reservation in Kansas, recommended the creation of a planning commission including the Public Health Service nurse, a VISTA worker, the Tribal Business Committee, and a representative of the conservative faction of the tribe. He recommended that the BIA be informed of developments but not involved in them. As a final reminder, he said that the planning commission should be aware of factionalism within the tribe.

The heaviest blows against the status quo come from both Murray and Rosalie Wax and from Roessel and Parmee. Murray Wax (139), writing on Indian education as a cultural transaction, noted that the difficulty does not lie in the technical inadequacy of educators but in lack of Indian control of schools and in their sense of powerlessness. This results in a disharmony in norms and values and sets home against school. Murray and Rosalie Wax (142) elaborated this theme in an evaluation of a Head Start program in Rapid City, South Dakota. They pointed out that Office of Economic Opportunity programs, including Head Start, were premised on community participation in decision making. This principle, however, was often compromised by such assumptions as (1) tribal leaders can always speak for parents; (2) tribal leaders will actually try to find out what the "out of power" members want; (3) progressive "mixed bloods" can represent the wishes of conservative "full bloods"; (4) acculturated Uncle Tomahawks, in their clerical and bureaucratic guise, can really represent the poor; and (5) Indian and non-Indian people in control will not feel they have satisfied the requirements of community participation by holding meetings after decisions have been made. Murray and Rosalie Wax (142) also said,

> Judged by its own standards which are traditional standards of

> most educators and welfare workers, Project Head Start in Rapid City is not only good, it is excellent. . . . If we criticize the Rapid City project it is because its very excellence is achieved on the basis of a colonial or White-Man's-Burden set of standards. . . (and) in the long run it will not provide the Indian community with the necessary assistance for its folk to move upward out of poverty.

Again, Murray Wax (140), in studying the Tribal Cherokee of eastern Oklahoma, found that

> Because the Cherokee National government has been preempted by a wealthy and politically powerful oligarchy, unrepresentative of the Tribal Cherokee and unresponsive to their requests, and because the U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs recognizes that government as the sole spokesman for the Cherokee, the Tribal Cherokee people are denied any political voice in the control of their own local affairs and have negligible influence on the school systems (whether local or federal) that serve their children.

Roessel (112), in an article entitled "The Right To Be Wrong and the Right To Be Right," stated: "Personally I believe that the right to be wrong was granted to the Indians in a large measure through the War on Poverty. The Office of Economic Opportunity . . . gave the Indians their first chance in an important, comprehensive way." The founder and first director of the Rough Rock Demonstration School cited Community Action Programs as examples of this and charged the BIA and public schools with making all decisions for Indians. He referred to his uneducated Navajo school board, which he said had more wisdom than he did in making decisions.

Johnson (64), in his interpretive account of the Rough Rock Demonstration School, described one of the two major premises on which the school rests:

> Second, the Rough Rock school is controlled and directed by the Navajo people themselves; and the supremely important aspect of this local control is to prove that the Indian has the interest, desire, and capacity to provide real leadership, direction and self-determination in education. The school was founded on the thesis that the Indian is best able to determine the content and direction of Indian education. In other words, the school is demonstrating that education of the Indian must be given to the Indian.

Parmee (100), reporting on a study of the San Carlos Apache Reservation, stated that parents and tribal leaders had been given no role in formulating an educational program. He advocated on-the-job training programs for Apache political leaders and officials. Parmee also noted that, if any developmental program on the reservation were to succeed, it would have to include active Apache participation in every phase.

In reporting on the First All-Indian Statewide Conference on California Indian Education, Forbes (44) said that "The California Indian people are attempting, through this effort, to gain some measure of influence over their own destiny and of the destiny of their children. By so doing, they are liberating themselves from the negative self images forced upon them by conquest. . . ." The conference urged school administrators and school boards to draw Indian parents into the affairs of the school and to develop better lines of communication with them. Further, it urged the State of California to seek Johnson-O'Malley funds from the Federal Government to be used in implementing the recommendations of the report (under the direction of a panel of Indians), and it asked that the State Advisory Commission on Indian Affairs have an Indian majority.

Additional comments on the Indian voice will be made in the following chapters, both with respect to constraints which must be dealt with and with what appear to be some encouraging developments in spite of the constraints.

Intelligence as a Factor in Educational Retardation

Intelligence as a possible factor in the educational disadvantage of Indian Americans gets almost no attention in the literature. There are, it is believed, two main reasons for this. First, few persons have any confidence in the validity of a culture-bound test for measuring innate intelligence, and most tests of mental ability are agreed to be culture-bound (especially those of the group variety). MacArthur (73) sought intelligence tests which would minimize cultural bias and concluded that the Progressive Matrices and the Safran Culture Reduced Intelligence Test were best but called for construction of norms appropriate to Indian groups. MacArthur (74) also concluded that "a large proportion of Canadian native pupils at early school age have the general intellectual ability which seems necessary to participate fully in the larger Canadian community."

A second reason for social scientists to be cool toward a consideration of intelligence as a cause of educational deficit is that such an assumption tends to center the cause on the individual rather than on the society in which he lives and, particularly, the school which he attends. Arthur Jensen, the educational psychologist, has recently suggested that there may be genetic differences which account for differing levels of intelligence among ethnic groups. This idea has been rejected almost totally by the community of social scientists.

McGrath (79) reported in 1960 on a study which sought to identify factors which appeared related to mental retardation. He found that much of what had been identified tentatively as mental retardation was really pseudo-mental retardation, caused by sociocultural factors.

Bentzen (15) and her associates, in a multidisciplinary approach to the identification of mentally retarded children on the Navajo Reservation, recognized this probability. At the outset of the program, she said,

> Since the pilot study is to take place on the Navajo Reservation, most of the children enrolled in school are *educationally* retarded due to cultural, social, and linguistic factors. The particular problem is to establish identification and selection criteria by which an interdisciplinary staff is able to select out of this total population those youngsters who, in addition to academic and social retardation, also demonstrate evidence of having . . . inadequate intelligence . . . to the degree that they are significantly impaired in their ability to adapt to the demands of society.

Bentzen (14) also reported that, of the original group of 56 pupils referred by teachers and others, 3 were found to be severely retarded mentally and 35 moderately retarded. In addition, 15 youngsters were found to be suffering from other kinds of handicapping conditions such as emotional disorders, hyperthyroidism, hearing impairment, and visual defects which had been confused with mental retardation.

Bryde (23) noted that he found no intelligence deficit among the Sioux students he studied; however, Miller (83), who measured the intelligence of Indian and white students in the Dakotas -- along with achievement, alienation, attitude toward school, and vocational maturity -- found large differences in favor of the white students on all variables.

Summary

A study of the recent literature seems to reveal, then, a fairly well-defined body of theory, formulated by the social sciences, concerning the causes of the educational disadvantage of Indian Americans. The theory calls for the primacy of biculturalism over acculturation; demands a bicultural approach to Indian education with reference to an understanding of, and respect for, Indian culture and suggests the use of Indian cultural materials in the instructional program; demands bilingual instruction in the teaching of English rather than teaching English as a second language; demands a special kind of teacher sensitized to Indian culture (preferably of Indian descent); and demands control by Indians of the schools which serve their children. This follows closely the social theory underlying the "Great Society" programs of the 1960's.

Chapter 5

PROPOSED REMEDIES FOR THE EDUCATIONAL DISADVANTAGE

To a considerable extent, the present chapter is the other side of the coin from the preceding one. The schools have reacted to the demands for more instructional materials based on Indian culture, for a bilingual approach to the teaching of English, for the sensitizing of teachers to cultural differences, and for a greater Indian voice in control of the schools which educate Indian children. However, there is no way of knowing how nearly adequate the current effort is, for the picture obtained from reading the published literature can be only a fragmented one. Neither is there a good way of telling how well practices espoused in conferences, workshops, and published guides are being implemented at the classroom level. It should be recognized that the ardent advocacy of some of the demands is fairly recent and that implementation is still in the developmental stage. In addition, it should be noted that there are practical constraints on implementation which are often unrecognized by persons not directly involved. Some of these constraints will be mentioned in the present and final chapters.

There are, encouragingly, one or two new ideas which seem to offer some hope for a breakthrough in overcoming the educational deficit of Indian children.

Bicultural Education

Bicultural Learning Materials

Of all the improvements suggested for Indian education, the greater use of instructional materials based on Indian culture should be the easiest to bring about since there is no real impediment to this. Keating (66), in her annotated bibliography of more than 200 books about children of minority cultures (72 of which are in the Indian section), says that "The American Indian has a glamorous appeal by having developed distinct cultures which provide a large base for research. Descriptive literature about American Indians is found in relative abundance in fiction and non-fiction at all reading levels."

Olsen (95), who compiled an annotated bibliography on Indians in literature listed 119 children's books categorized as biography and fictionalized biography, lore and legend, stories and novels, and general information and background materials.

Ferris (43), in writing on the Indians of New Mexico, gives a short informational sketch on 18 Pueblo communities, the Navajos, the Apaches, and the Utes. In addition, the BIA has prepared informational material on a large number of tribal groups which is available from the U. S. Government Printing Office (26).

The Rough Rock Demonstration School (64) has a Navajo Curriculum Center which is producing materials based on Navajo legend, history, and biography -- including Coyote Stories of the Navajo People and Grandfather

Stories of the Navajo. The Alaska Rural School Project (*), based at the University of Alaska, has as one of its activities the development of the Alaska Readers, which have an Eskimo or Indian village setting rather than the more usual suburban one. This project is receiving technical assistance from the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory and cooperative support from both the Alaska State Department of Education and the BIA.

As Bauer (12) points out, a great deal of bicultural learning material, including the Little Herder Series (28), was developed by the BIA, mostly during the 1940's. Most of the material is still available from the Publications Service at Haskell Institute, Lawrence, Kansas, which will send a price list upon request. The material -- which includes anthropological studies, arts-and-crafts guides, and children's readers -- is in great demand by the general public. However, there is some reason to believe (*) that, for an unknown reason, the material may not be as widely used by the schools as would seem desirable.

Bryde (22), who discovered severe alienation among the Sioux students of South Dakota, believes that the remedy lies in instructional material which he refers to as "acculturational psychology" or "modern Indian psychology." He has been developing this material with the support of the BIA. The material will present the Indian student with a clear history of his race to give him pride in his heritage (traditional history courses often give a negative image) and an understanding of cultural values and how they arise historically, often for economic reasons. Also, the material will include a comparative study of Indian and Anglo values.

Curriculum Development

Some ongoing activities approach bicultural education in a more comprehensive way by developing a curriculum which includes Indian cultural materials. Groesbeck's (53) report on a proposed supplemental reading program developed by the Northern Arizona Supplementary Education Center (under Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act) was mentioned in the preceding chapter. And Cata (31) reported on the first stage of a social studies program being developed by the University of New Mexico for the Navajo Area of the BIA: a beginning preschool unit and a first-grade unit, with materials for grades 2 through 12 to be completed. Cata made clear that the project includes not only the production of Navajo culture-based instructional materials but also a continuing program of teacher training in social studies across cultures.

The BIA, which for years has had differentiated basic learning goals for elementary children (27), is now in the process of revising its entire social studies program in what it calls Project NECESSITIES (*).

Renaud (110), reporting on "an experiment in curriculum development with children of Indian background in Saskatchewan," has the following suggestions for adapting a standard curriculum to use with Indian children. First is what he calls the "theory of pegs and gaps" -- that is, find the main pegs in the curriculum and the gaps in it which relate to the local Indian tradition; then the objectives and content must be assessed against the ongoing life on the reservation and the necessary adjustments made. Second, the images, beliefs, and attitudes that the Indian child brings to school must be reinterpreted in terms of the dominant society -- extending the interpretation beyond the limits of the child's experiences and expanding and enriching his experience. Third is the inclusion of functional learning, for example, the basic skills. Fourth is the selection of content for community educational development -- things which adults need to know for decision making.

Silvaroli and Zuchowski (119), working with the faculty of the Fort Thomas public school (the enrollment of which was 85 percent Apache), developed four main goals. Two of these were, as might be expected, the sensitizing of teachers to cultural differences and the modification of the traditionally oriented textbook curriculum. The other two goals, however, were "the identification of significant problems confronting the Indian student in an Anglo oriented school" and "the establishment of an instructional organization which is best suited to the needs of the children and teachers in the Fort Thomas system." Teachers were urged to be sure that concepts were being learned and to teach in units such as "the desert" or "the cattle industry." Teachers were given additional help such as an art resource teacher, a materials resource center, psychological services, and teacher aides. Outside consultants were brought in for creative art, programmed learning, cuisinaire rods, language experience approach to reading, and visual and auditory discrimination. A special reading teacher was added. An ungraded plan was installed at the primary level. An evaluation of the program showed that, while the Indian pupils were not making dramatic gains on the Anglo students, both Indian and Anglo students seemed to be improving.

Bilingual Education

It is more difficult to tell from the literature what is happening in the field of bilingual instruction of Indian students. This is particularly true with reference to the public schools. Maynes (77) reported in 1967 that the following Arizona public school systems had programs in English as a second language for Indian children: Casa Grande, Chinle, Flagstaff, Ganado, Globe, Holbrook, Kayenta, Peach Springs, Sells, Snowflake, Tuba City, Whiteriver, and Window Rock. In comparison with only a few years earlier, this represents significant progress.

In 1968, Digneo and Shaya (39) reported on use of the Miami Linguistic Reading Program as part of the New Mexico Western States Small Schools Project. The Miami Linguistic Readers were being used with Spanish-speaking and Indian American children in six New Mexico schools or school systems: the West Las Vegas school system, the Anton Chico Elementary School in Santa Rosa, the Pojoaque Valley schools, the River View Elementary School in Albuquerque, the Washington Elementary School in Las Cruces, and the Gallup-McKinley County school system. The editors reported that they are "delighted with the results." Unfortunately, evaluative comments by school personnel are of a general and impressionistic kind and, while favorable, lack quantitative evidence to support them.

Bauer (12), of the BIA, in her report to the Third Annual TESOL Convention at Chicago in March of 1969 gave a quite complete summary of the BIA's bilingual activities up to that time. She alluded to the BIA's pioneering efforts in bilingual education in the late 1930's and early 1940's, which were interrupted by World War II, and to the Five-Year Navajo Program (35) beginning in 1946, which used bilingual instructional aides. It might be noted also that, in 1958, the BIA published the Navajo-English Dictionary (138).

Bauer's talk and other information in the files of the BIA indicate a resurgence of effort in the bilingual field within the last several years, however. Wide use has been made of consultants. In 1967, the Center for Applied Linguistics (93) in Washington, D.C., made a report and recommendations on the problems of teaching English to Indian Americans and has continued in a consultative capacity, preparing three newsletters on English for Indian Americans and conducting a planning conference for a bilingual kindergarten program for Navajo children in October of 1968. The center has also done a study contrasting the teaching of English to speakers of Choctaw, Navajo, and Papago.

Materials for teaching English as a second language at Navajo BIA schools have been developed by consultants from the University of California at Los Angeles and the University of Arizona, and appropriate tests have been constructed by a consultant from the University of Southern California. A consultant from Colorado State University has taught forty BIA teachers at each of five Navajo Agencies in a seven-week course in linguistic theory and methodology for teaching English as a second language. Programs in English as a second language are now operating in all schools on the Navajo Reservation and in many of the village schools in Alaska.

In November of 1969, a conference on bilingual and bicultural education for Alaskan native youths was held at the University of Alaska -- with the University of Alaska, the Alaska State Department of Education, and the BIA collaborating. As a result, plans have been formulated to launch a pilot program for initial instruction in the Eskimo language at one or more BIA schools beginning in September of 1970. A pilot program for initial instruction in Navajo is also under way on the Navajo Reservation and will be evaluated by a specialist from the University of New Mexico.

A different kind of language activity has been a creative writing project carried out in ten BIA high schools under the direction of a faculty member from the Institute of American Indian Arts and a consultant from the University of California at Los Angeles. A manual for teachers and a published volume of poetry and prose by Indian high school students are among the results.

Zintz (153), of the University of New Mexico, has produced a classroom teacher's guide to bilingual education which should prove invaluable to all teachers of Indian children but particularly to those new at the job. And Ulibarri (132), also of the University of New Mexico, has reported on interpretive studies on bilingual education:

> The very obvious implication for bilingual education is that it should open its doors to research and evaluation. There are too many facets in bilingual education that are relatively unknown; some of them are as yet not even couched in good theory. To embark on a course of action just because it seems logical is to commit the age-old sin of educational practice with the possibility of bringing about the same disastrous effects.

Ulibarri's warning is exceptional in the literature. One is much more likely to find theory being advanced than reports of studies which test out theory. One exception is the report by Mickelson and Galloway (81) of a study designed to test Deutsch's "cumulative deficit hypothesis" to the effect that lack of appropriate language stimulation in early home and school life makes success in school activities progressively more difficult with age. The study, carried out by the University of Victoria with Indian children on four reserves in the southern part of Vancouver Island in 1968, tended to confirm the hypothesis. However, more importantly, the study indicates that the phenomenon can be corrected by involving the child in specific and well-planned language experiences.

Hoffman (59), noting that many reservation schools (Navajo) were engaged in exciting pioneering efforts in bilingual education, also reflected that some were not; perhaps, she thought, for lack of programs which the administrators considered worthy. She then commented that most modern programs in English as a second language have evolved to a sentence-pattern-practice type, with the more appropriate ones being based in structural analysis of English and usually written under the direction of linguists. Others, of the locally produced variety, reflect a recognized need for some kind of systematic presentation and practice. Hoffman stated that at Rough Rock, however, the program begins with the idea that English is a system of rules, not primarily a list of patterns or a body of vocabulary. The system is revealed through structurally related sample sentences and questions. According to Hoffman, this method enables pupils to "create" their own language appropriately for the situation in which they find themselves.

Teacher Training

Enough instances of specialized training of teachers of Indian children are reported in the literature to indicate that some significant efforts are being made in this area. It would be misleading, however, to imply that all such efforts are new. The BIA (*) has conducted summer workshops for its teachers, administrators, guidance workers, and other personnel for many years. Also, each fall, the Navajo Area and the Aberdeen (Dakota) Area of the BIA conduct orientation sessions for new teachers. The Alaska Area of the BIA has for the last several years held a midwinter training session for teachers in Fairbanks or Anchorage, partly to relieve the tedium of life on the tundra. Further, the BIA for some thirty years issued a biweekly newsletter to teachers and other employees, with inservice training as one of its objectives. Thompson's book (131) on education for cross-cultural enrichment is a compilation of selected articles from the BIA newsletter over a twelve-year period (1952-1964).

Two other organizations for the last ten years or more have held annual conferences which have helped to focus attention on the problems of Indian education as well as to elucidate them. The Navajo Tribe (88) has conducted annually a conference on Navajo education, as well as a Navajo Youth Conference. The Arizona Coordinating Council for Research in Indian Education (19)(3) has also convened an annual meeting of interested persons from the tribal, state, Federal, public school, and university communities in the Southwest to explore better ways of educating the Indian people. As an outgrowth of this activity, Bernardoni (18), in 1961, compiled and issued a volume of practical teaching suggestions by practicing teachers of Indian children for the benefit of those who are less experienced.

Poehlman (105)(103), working with graduate seminar students at the University of Nevada in 1966, issued handbooks for use by teachers and counselors of Indian students. In 1964, Potts and Sizemore (107)(122) conducted summer workshops at Adams State College for teachers of Indian children in the Four Corners Area and issued teacher guides as a result.

Nix (89) conducted an Indian education workshop at Arizona State University in 1962 and issued a publication, Keys to Indian Education, which was cited in the preceding chapter. In 1968, Miller (84) held a training institute on English as a second language at the University of

Montana for thirty-six teachers of Indian children in the Plains and Northwestern States; this institute was funded under the National Defense Education Act. Bauer of the BIA (*) reported that in the summer of 1968, of nineteen institutes on English as a second language funded under the National Defense Education Act, five were designed specifically for teachers of Indian children.

Lopez' (72) account of the annual orientation of new teachers in the Santo Domingo public elementary school in New Mexico has been cited earlier. In addition, in the spring of 1967, the Mesa (Arizona) Public School District held a one-week seminar on Indian education (106). The district's sphere of influence was said to include five different Indian reservations, with sixty-five representatives from a dozen different schools attending.

In 1964, Greenburg and Greenburg (50) published a source book, *Education of the American Indian in Today's World*, for the use of teachers. In addition, the State Department of Education of Idaho publishes a well-done guide, *There's an Indian in Your Classroom* (63), for use of public school teachers who have one or more Indian students in class. The guide contains a wealth of information which should be helpful both to teachers and, indirectly, to Indian students. The Upper Midwest Regional Eudcational Laboratory, Inc. at St. Paul has published *Minnesota Chippewa Indians, A Handbook for Teachers* (37), which serves a similar purpose for public school teachers of Chippewa students in the State of Minnesota and which no dobut would be useful to teachers of Chippewa students anywhere.

Vontress (136), in a paper given before the American Personnel and Guidance Association in 1968, urged better professional training of counselors of Indian students. He said that unless these counselors have a broad understanding of national and international cultural differences, the people being counseled may be alienated. As it is, counselors sometimes abdicate their responsibilities to untrained paraprofessionals because the latter can relate better to the counselees. This, he says, is unfortunate and the counselor must fill the gaps in his own training.

Two state directors of Indian education, Owens (98) of New Mexico in 1967 and Lindemuth (71) of Washington in 1968, called for a greater expenditure of Johnson-O'Malley funds for inservice training of public school teachers of Indian students.

The involvement of two other institutions of higher learning, Oklahoma State University (94) and Northern Montana College (90), in the education of teachers of Indian students has been mentioned briefly in the preceding chapter but will be cited again here. The student teaching of Oklahoma State University students at Chilocco School could be significant in a state with the large Indian population of Oklahoma, where nearly all Indian students attend public school. Even more encouraging is the proposal of the Havre Public School District and Northern Montana College to institute a preservice training program which would prepare teachers and teacher aides for service in a specific location, namely, the Rocky Boy's Indian Reservation.

Teacher Aides

The proposal to train Indian teacher aides in Montana has just been noted. There is, apparently, a growing trend in this direction. As early as 1965, under a Community Action grant from the Office of Economic Opportunity, Arizona State University conducted an eight-week training program for Indian teacher aides and developed a handbook for Indian teacher aides by Steere *et al*. (126). Thomas (130) has reported on a Navajo teacher aide training program which the Tuba City Public School District has been carrying on since 1965. And AVCO Economic Systems Corporation, under contract with the BIA, has issued a training guide, *The Preparation of BIA Teacher and Dormitory Aides, Vol. I*. (7), which is an outgrowth of four teacher aide workshops conducted by AVCO for BIA during the 1967-68 academic year. In addition, Fort Lewis State College in Colorado and Anchorage Community College in Alaska have trained dormitory aides for the BIA in the past years (*).

It will be noted that, in the references cited, the emphasis has been on the *inservice* training of teachers, with not much indication of *preservice* training. In 1962, McGrath (78) reported that at that time there was a total of fifteen college education courses with the word "Indian" in the course title being offered by southwestern institutions. Of these, twelve were being offered by Arizona State University. The situation has no doubt improved since that time, but no more recent survey has been found. McGrath reported that the five southwestern institutions (in Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah) having the largest Indian enrollment were Arizona State College (now Northern Arizona State University), Brigham Young University, Fort Lewis A&M (now Fort Lewis State College), Arizona State University, and the University of New Mexico. McGrath indicated, however, that the University of Utah and the University of Arizona had been active in Indian affairs. An up-to-date, comprehensive survey of the role of universities and colleges in the training of teachers of Indian students, as well as a survey of other aspects of Indian affairs, would be most useful.

The Indian Voice

In May of 1967, an interdepartmental study group (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and Department of the Interior) reported to the Senate Subcommittee on Education on the question of organizational location within the Federal Government of responsibility for Indian education (135). Its sixth recommendation read as follows:

> Every effort should be made to encourage Indian parents and tribal leaders to assume increasing interest in and responsibility for the education of Indian children in accordance with the concept of community action. School boards, elected by the community and entrusted with appropriate responsibility for education, should be adopted as standard operating procedure. Specialized training programs should be instituted for board members. Study also should be given to the possibility of making grants directly to Indian groups to administer their own educational systems.

In December of 1968, the Senate Subcommittee on Indian Education asked the BIA and the U. S. Office of Education for a progress report. The BIA (*) replied as follows:

> Considerable effort has been expended to involve Indian people in developing the guidelines to implement the functional operation of local boards, both at the advisory and contractual level. The National Indian Education Advisory Committee has worked closely with the Bureau in the development of these guidelines; likewise, they have been reviewed by personnel in each Area office and at a Bureauwide meeting of the directors of Indian education. A workshop has been held in one area involving tribal representatives and a handbook to serve as a guide for training of school board members was developed. A planning session has been held by an ad hoc committee of Indian leaders to develop a week-long National Indian Workshop on School Affairs to be held in Utah in March of 1969. Reports from each area indicate that nearly all schools have established a school board of some type; Alaska has 99 percent of its schools with a board and they report 85 percent of these are actively involved in management roles. The Navajo Area reported 51 of 56 schools with organized school boards involved in performing functions such as assisting in getting all children into school, assisting in setting up campus and school regulations, participating in the inspection of school physical plants, disseminating information about school to the community, and many related functions.

The formation of the National Indian Education Advisory Committee in 1966 has been described in Chapter 2, as has the inclusion of six of its members on the advisory board of the National Study of Indian Education. The creation of the National Council on Indian Opportunity in 1968 has also been described in Chapter 2. Six prominent Indian leaders serve as members of the council (87).

Nevertheless, to most persons who press the point, the "Indian voice" means not advisory but decision-making powers. With a view to expanding these powers among Indian people in the operation of the schools which serve their children, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in 1969 sought to have a policy statement published in the Code of Federal Regulations. This policy would not only approve of advisory school boards in Federal schools but also would authorize the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to "negotiate contracts with Indian school boards which have been formally established within the legal framework of a recognized tribe, band, pueblo, or other group, . . . and expend funds thereunder for the operation of Federal schools by such terms as may be agreed upon" (*).

The commissioner's plan ran into legalistic problems. He had wished to permit the operation of schools by tribal communities in keeping with the "Rough Rock model." In 1966, the BIA had contracted out the operation of the Rough Rock boarding school on the Navajo Reservation to tribal interests. But in that case the contract had been with a small group of prominent Navajos incorporated under the laws of the State of Arizona and known as Diné, Inc., not with the tribe itself. It was the Solicitor's opinion that such contracts could be made with legally incorporated groups, including Indian tribes incorporated under the laws of the state in which they reside, but that neither the Johnson-O'Malley Act nor the "Buy Indian Act" authorized the BIA to contract with unincorporated tribes, bands, or school boards. More will be said about this impasse in the following chapter.

Stout (128), of Arizona State University, reported on an inservice training course which he conducted at the request of the BIA administration of the Navajo Area from October of 1968 to May of 1969. Participants were BIA school principals, education specialists, subagency superintendents, and agency superintendents on the Navajo Reservation. Some of the purposes of the course were to sensitize further the administrative personnel of the whole area to the importance of parent-community involvement; to devise a training program for future school board members, stressing the responsibilities and duties they would need to assume and perform; to develop ways of setting up parent-child education centers to take advantage of the parent's role in the early learnings of young children, as well as their role throughout the child's school life; and to cause the foregoing to be a reservation-wide endeavor by involving all administrative personnel. The trainee group developed a list of 121 suggestions for involvement of parents in the life of the school and 37 suggestions for the functions of school boards.

As proof that the Indian voice can be effective in the control of schools, one can cite not only the Rough Rock Demonstration School but also the Navajo Community College which is now in its second year of operation. It will be noted that Ashe (5), in his 1966 study, recommended the establishment of a joint-county junior college district (Navajo and Apache counties) to be administered by a person selected by the official board of the joint district, with the advice and consent of the Navajo Education Committee. As it finally evolved, the Navajo

Community College is entirely tribally controlled, although non-Navajos and non-Indians are eligible for enrollment.

What is perhaps a classic example of an effective Indian voice has been the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on California Indian Education (44). In an almost totally Indian effort -- utilizing the services of only one non-Indian advisor -- the committee issued a set of remarkably constructive recommendations to school administrators and school boards, to teachers, to colleges and universities, to the State of California, and to the Federal Government. In a move almost without precedent, its first recommendation was to Indian parents and communities, urging them to assume responsibility for the education of their children by encouraging them, by participating in school affairs, and by providing supplementary learnings in Indian culture. Among its recommendations was that the Federal Government re-enter the Indian education picture in California by again making California Indian youths eligible for Federal boarding schools in selected cases, and for BIA college scholarship grants, as well as providing Johnson-O'Malley funds to public schools enrolling Indian children. It is significant that these recommendations have all been complied with already.

Compensatory Education

A number of reports deal with what is commonly called "compensatory education," which is an educationist's, not a social scientist's, term

It implies certain lacks or deficits within the child's home or community environment which must be compensated for by the school. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, particularly Title I of that Act, was predicated on the idea of compensatory education, and several of the references cited here relate to that Act.

Sizemore (121), in "Closing the Gap in Indian Education" which was prepared for the National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty in 1967, listed twenty innovative ideas which had been employed in Arizona under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. These ideas ranged all the way from after-school study areas to mobile science laboratories and psychological services. Wade (137) reported in 1966 that, of forty-two school districts in South Dakota enrolling over 3,000 Indian students, all but seven had participated in Title I with remedial and enrichment programs. The Arizona State Educational Agency (2), in its 1967 evaluation report of Title I programs, listed as one of its major achievements the establishment of programs on English as a second language for Indians. It also listed the establishment of thirty-eight reading centers, along with use of teacher aides, programs for pre-first-grade children, and resource centers for independent study.

Simpson (120) evaluated the Title I programs in Clallam and Jefferson counties in the State of Washington and found their principal deficiencies: the programs were not being aimed specifically enough at disadvantaged children and were being diluted by a multiplicity of programs.

In 1968, the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes of Idaho (118) sponsored a two-week field trip throughout the Northwest for thirty students who would be seventh graders the following year. The project, characterized as experimental enrichment, was felt to be necessary because of the restricted opportunity for learning in the home-community environment and the unsuitability of the public school curriculum for Indian students.

Paskewitz and Stark (101) described a summer enrichment program carried out in the summer of 1967 with Chippewa youngsters on the White Earth Reservation in Minnesota by fifteen volunteer students from the University of Minnesota.

Salisbury (115), describing the College Orientation Program for Alaska Natives at the University of Alaska, said that the native student comes to college from a culture where he has been "reinforced for reticence." Thus, the orientation program seeks to broaden the student's background of experience within the Western culture so that his conceptual knowledge of the English language will improve and to enable the student to realize that his thoughts and feelings are important and have real value when they are expressed clearly and effectively.

Early Childhood Education and Adult Education

Both early childhood education and adult education are advanced in the literature as ways of remedying the educational disadvantage from which Indian Americans suffer. This is logical enough, if only for the reason that each represents an extension of the time period available to educators for overcoming the educational deficit. Vaughan et al. (135), in 1967, observed that "Education must be viewed as a single, continuing process which ranges from pre-school through adulthood."

Of all the Great Society programs, none has been more popular or has received a better "press" than Head Start for preschool children. Carried out originally by the Office of Economic Opportunity, Head Start has been active in many, if not most, Indian communities. The Senate Subcommittee report (134) states that "means have been found to bus 2,300 Navajo Headstart children on a daily basis to 115 different sites across the reservation. . . ." McKinley (80) announced himself as a chief proponent of preschool education. Ortiz (96) reported that, in the Indian community he studied, Head Start was welcomed and viewed as the solution to all the problems -- a "view which has not been discouraged." Murray and Rosalie Wax (142) and Bee (13) also evaluated Head Start programs, as noted earlier.

In 1968, the BIA (*), with funding for kindergartens in its appropriation for the first time, initiated approximately thirty-five kindergarten units with continuous increases projected for future years until kindergarten classes were available in both Federal and public schools for all Indian five-year-olds who could be reached on a day basis. As noted earlier, the Center for Applied Linguistics (92) conducted a planning conference for a bilingual kindergarten program for Navajo children in the fall of 1968, and the National Association for the Education of Young Children (86) developed a kindergarten curriculum guide for Indian children at about the same time.

Some attention is given in the literature to adult education, although the volume of it is not very impressive. Possibly the cause of the deficit is that this has been a neglected area on most Indian reservations. Lekanof (70) calls for a much stronger adult education effort in the native villages of Alaska. And Miller (82) states that one of the most important questions in Indian education in the State of North Dakota is what type of adult education program would be most effective; he also says that extensive and inviting adult education programs geared to the needs and problems peculiar to the Indian adult would assist in the transfer of favorable attitudes to the next generation (83).

McKinley (80) cited a leadership training course taken by the Tribal Council of his tribal group as being helpful, and Roessel (111)(113) taught courses in adult education and community development at Arizona State University in the early 1960's. Ashe (5) recommended that the projected Navajo Community College include vocational training in its curriculum, including the upgrading of the skills of persons already employed. The Navajo Community College has followed this course, and Roessel's ideas about adult education and community development have been incorporated both there and at the Rough Rock Demonstration School.

Woods and Harkins (148) said that Indian adults new to the urban environment need education of the most practical kind with respect to maps, transportation, telephones, finding suitable housing, shopping, money management, family budgeting, and use of utilities and appliances, as well as needing education about more abstract things such as an understanding of male and female roles in an industrialized setting, adjustment to the advantages of stable work, and overcoming sensitivity to criticism.

Buckley (24) recommended to the Department of Natural Resources of the Province of Saskatchewan that an adult education program be developed which would emphasize a central core of basic education courses designed to remedy major deficiencies resulting from the lack of adequate primary education in the past.

Brophy and Aberle (21), citing BIA figures, noted that, in 1964, some 168 Indian communities had adult education programs costing approximately $1,000,000. It was at about this time, however, that the BIA (*) changed the emphasis in its program from basic adult education to community development with a reduced budget.

There is amazingly little said in the literature about vocational education. One of the stated purposes of the field trip sponsored by the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes (118) for their students was an introduction to new vocations and occupations. Paskewitz and Stark (101) listed vocational motivation as one of the objectives of their summer program for Chippewa youths. Buckley (24) recommended to the Saskatchewan government that there be appointed immediately to the northern vocational training program staff a qualified person to devote full time to guidance, job placement, and follow-up counseling for graduates who are holding jobs.

Edington and Hocker (41), reporting on a conference held in Albuquerque in August of 1969, have given most attention to the matter. Indian delegates to the conference recommended more involvement of Indians in the determination of vocational needs, curriculum development, and school policies; immediate cooperation of local, state, and Federal agencies with Indian people in planning new vocational approaches, and changing present ones to meet present needs better; more involvement of industry in vocational education and determination of needs; teachers seeing industry in operation; more relevant vocational instruction, including emphasis on male vocational counseling; information concerning vocational programs available in all agencies; more on-the-job training and direct contact with industry that would include city living experiences and budgeting; and adequate financial resources to provide clothing and other basic needs while in training.

"Ethno-pedagogy"

Noteworthy, if for no other reason than because it recognizes a need for a rapprochement between the social scientists and the educationists, is a volume by Henry Burger (30), an anthropologist with the Southwestern

Cooperative Educational Laboratory, which he calls Ethno-pedagogy. Burger offered it as a manual which attempts to "present the basic information that the teacher-leader must know for an inter-ethnic classroom." He indicates that the manual was designed for both theory and practice -- to accommodate both the social science theorists and the classroom practitioners. It contains sample applications of educational anthropology to six southwestern cultures: Mexican Americans, Negroes, Amerindians in general, Navajos, Pueblos, and Yankees (Burger's term for Anglos).

Burger contends that because school success and failure can be shown to be statistically different for various ethnic groups, an application of the sociocultural sciences is required, and particularly the anthropological subdiscipline of directed culture change, or telesis. He says that "learning theory fails, for psychology distinguishes within one culture." Burger also states:

> John Dewey's belief that the schools will democratize and progressivize all children is doubted by anthropology. School is found to be an instrument of society. It best succeeds when it fits extant patterns and trends. For example, by conducting education in the child's home language, the school can capitalize on a device offering great emotional support and interest. . . .

The rigidity of the industrialized culture of the United States is decried by Burger, who says that minorities are damaged by it. "By contrast, cultural pluralism or polyethnicity favors the preservation of communal life. . . ." This conflict results in frustrations which he sees as engendering cultural pluralism and perhaps even separatism from the Anglo way in many minorities.

Burger suggests that "a middle pattern is possible syncretism, mutual compromise. In such a system, one pattern may be used for one sector of life, while another pattern is used for another. For example, the Anglo system may be used for mathematics, whereas the Hispanic system may be used for art." In a separate but related publication, Bass and Burger (11) suggest what they call a "de-skilling" of teacher functions -- some teachers may teach substantive matters such as mathematical formulas but others may take the role of the second mother figure, "a tender-loving-carer."

The foregoing brief description does not do justice to Burger's proposal. It can be said that, in his discussion of "mutual compromise" between the social scientists and the educationists, Burger remains very much the anthropologist. But at least his proposal for an "operationalizing" of the social sciences is something more definite than was encountered anywhere else.

Styles of Learning

Most innovative, and perhaps most stimulating, are several suggestions in the literature (a) that Indian children in their native culture may learn in ways or "styles" which are quite different from those of Anglo children in the dominant culture and (b) that, if these styles are identified and understood, schools can modify instruction in ways which will be helpful to Indian children and will assist in removing their educational disadvantage. Overlooking the undoubted difficulties of translating such findings into action in actual school situations, there is a logic behind the proposal which commends it highly as a subject for research.

In August of 1968, the Center for Applied Linguistics, at the request of the BIA, held a conference at Stanford University and as a result issued the report, Styles of Learning Among American Indians. An Outline for Research (32). One of the principal assumptions of the conference is as follows:

> It is assumed that there is a direct relationship between the nature of learning among children in the setting of their Indian society and the teaching procedures and kinds of learning which take place in schools, and that an understanding of the styles of learning employed by American Indian groups will have important implications for educational planning for American Indians and for teaching techniques used in their education.

The conference also noted a lack of earlier studies in this field and concluded that there was sufficient incidental evidence available to justify more specific studies.

Courtney B. Cazden of Harvard University and Vera P. John of Yeshiva University (32), in a paper presented at the Stanford conference, suggested as possible differentiated styles of learning peculiar to Indian children a "learning by looking," differences in learning a language which may affect cognitive processes, differences in cultural values, and differing patterns of socialization (e.g., discipline).

Other studies provide interesting support for these speculations. Young (150) has commented: "Within this framework (culture) and . . . within the framework imposed by the structure of the language he speaks, one is conditioned to look upon the world about him in a manner that may differ substantially from that characterizing another and distinct cultural system." Mathiot (76) suggests an inductive approach to the study of the relation between the language, the culture, and the cognitive system of a people. Garber (48), reporting on a study of styles of learning among minority group children in the Southwest, said that

> A general trend was found favoring the performance on a variety of psychometric instruments of one group over the other groups. Generally, the rural Spanish-American first graders studied performed higher than the Pueblo first graders who, in turn, performed higher than the Navajo first graders. Certain important exceptions to the trend emerged. Though the rural Spanish-American child was more adept at using auditory channels of communication, the American Indian groups showed unexpected strength in handling information through visual channels. (Emphasis added.)

Berman (17) suggests that significant advantages of programmed instruction with educationally retarded minority group children may be: (a) that they get a high proportion of items correct; (b) that they can move at their own pace and, so, not get behind; (c) that they are not punished either in front of the entire class or in private; and (d) that there is a reinforcing experience and the child gains confidence in his intellectual abilities.

A study of styles of learning of Indian children is still awaiting adequate funding and implementation.

The Senate Subcommittee on Indian Education

The report of the Special Senate Subcommittee on Indian Education (134) offers no fewer than sixty recommendations for the improvement of

Indian education. The report finds nothing good in the present situation, either in the public school or in the Federal school sectors. Many of the recommendations by the subcommittee follow those of the social scientists as described in Chapter 4. Many others are in the nature of suggested organizational changes, including the formation of a Select Committee on the Human Needs of the American Indian in the Senate, congressional authorization of a White House Conference on American Indian Affairs, and establishment of a National Indian Board of Indian Education with authority to set standards and criteria for the Federal schools.

The report calls for much better funding of educational programs for Indians and suggests a comprehensive Indian Education Act to meet the educational needs of both the public and Federal schools. The report also recommends better funding of the Johnson-O'Malley Act, Public Laws 874 and 815 as they apply to Indians, the Bilingual Education Act, and others. The report implies discrimination against Indians in the public schools by recommending that the Civil Rights Enforcement Office of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should investigate such possible discrimination. It states that the Federal school system should be an exemplary system.

There are recommendations concerning the Federal boarding school system, a subject which will be dealt with briefly in the following chapter. In addition, a thorough review of the vocational education and manpower programs in the BIA is suggested, as well as an expansion of funding of the BIA college scholarship program with changes in policy affecting the administration of these funds. The establishment of a graduate institute of Indian languages, history, and culture is advocated, perhaps in conjunction with the Smithsonian Institution. An exemplary program of adult education is recommended.

The recommendations conclude by calling for a much more aggressive stand, by Indians and by the BIA on behalf of Indians, relative to an influential voice in the public schools, particularly through administration of the Johnson-O'Malley program, as well as for increased operation of schools by Indians through contracts with the BIA.

Chapter 6

UNRESOLVED ISSUES AND PROBLEMS

Research in Indian education has, for the most part, been haphazard. However, there are signs that the first steps are being taken in attaining some cohesion -- with the U. S. Office of Education, the regional laboratories, the ERIC Clearinghouses, and a number of universities lending support and guidance to the local, state, and Federal agencies. There is as yet, however, no sign of the kinds of funding resources which will be necessary to mount a significant program of research, and no more than a beginning has been made on the necessary coordination. Perhaps the President's proposed National Institute of Education will speed the process if it comes into being.

The attempt in the foregoing chapters to synthesize the literature of the past ten years does reveal that a number of problems and issues in Indian education require illumination and resolution if a forward thrust really is to be generated. Some of the issues are highly controversial -- indeed, abrasively so. To omit discussion of them here would be, it would seem, to leave this attempt at synthesis incomplete and, to a large degree, meaningless. At the same time the writer must make clear that his perceptions of the issues have been formed not only from an examination of the literature but also from a rather intimate involvement with the problems of Indian education as a specialist and administrator over a period of a good many years.

The Issue of Biculturalism vs. Acculturation as It Relates to Overcoming Educational Disadvantage

There appear to be definite ideological differences between the educational practitioners and their critics, many of whom are social scientists or linguists. The writings of the latter tend to dominate the literature. Perhaps only this writer has noticed, or thought it noteworthy, that of the fifty-eight participants in the National Research Conference on American Indian Education (6) held in the spring of 1967 at Pennsylvania State University, nineteen or almost one-third were practicing professors of anthropology or sociology and another half-dozen were anthropologists or sociologists holding jobs other than professorships. There were eleven educationists, most of them strongly oriented toward anthropology; only one of the eleven represented the public school sector and he at the state level. There were four representatives of the BIA, one psychologist, one economist, and five participants in miscellaneous categories. There was no educational psychologist specializing in learning theory in attendance, and no political scientist. Finally, there were thirteen Indians, only six of whom could be said to be representing tribal groups. The major recommendation of the conference was that there be a national study of Indian education, in all aspects of which Indians should have a major voice.

Concern about the education of Indians is most often expressed in terms of the educational deficits from which Indians suffer: their low educational attainment in terms of years of schooling, their low achievement as measured by standardized tests, their high rate of dropout from school, the low percentage of high school graduates enrolling in college, and the low college graduation rate. These are the educational disadvantages of Indians about which the public is usually told. Sometimes there is also a comment on such things as the low self-concept of the Indian student. The deficits are real. We have tried to document them in Chapter 3, noting their severity, but showing also that there are signs of progress.

The main preoccupation of the social scientists appears to be, however, with the following things: bicultural education or cultural pluralism as opposed to acculturational education; bilingual education, including initial instruction in the native tongue ; a specially prepared kind of teacher of Indian children, preferably of Indian ancestry; and the preeminence of Indians in decision-making roles in schools which enroll their children. Without saying so, explicitly, as a usual thing, the implication appears to be that if these things are brought about, the educational deficits will disappear or, at least, will disappear more rapidly. If the foregoing sentence states the social science position at all accurately, then two comments are in order. First, there is no real evidence in the literature to support that position. This is not to say that the theory is unsound -- there simply are no data at this time to bear it out. The second comment is that the objectives listed above may be important and worthwhile in their own right -- for humane, or ethical, or democratic reasons, or because they may lead to a better life for individual Indians in a qualitative sense. If this is the rationale, it should be stated as such. If not, then steps should be taken to subject the theory to the most rigorous tests of validity.

Moynihan (85) makes the same point:

> I have sought to argue, by illustration, that social science is at its weakest, at its worst, when it offers theories of individual or collective behavior which raise the possibility, by controlling certain inputs, of bringing about mass behavioral change. No such knowledge now exists. Evidence is fragmented, contradictory, incomplete. . . .
>
> In the late 1960's the circles in New York that a decade earlier had conceived community action as a cure for delinquency, came forward with the notion that a slightly different form would cure educational retardation on the part of minority group school children. Community control might improve the school performance of school children. It might not. No one knows. It might have other effects that are quite desirable, or undesirable. It is a perfectly reasonable proposal to try out. But at this time it is almost unforgivable that it should be put forward as a "proven" remedy for anything.

Some observers believe that the distance between the theorists and the practitioners is wide and will not be bridged easily. Lamberts (68), in the Foreword of Teaching English as a Second Language, speaks of the antagonism which often exists between teachers and linguists:

> Linguistics is not a teaching method but a growing body of knowledge and theory; and although it may offer helpful answers . . . it surely does not know all the answers. . . . Antagonisms stem from such fundamental differences in viewpoints that they will not soon disappear. This is not based on such relatively trivial antagonisms as those caused by the terminological excesses of the linguists; or by their enthusiastic exaggeration of the importance of a linguistic approach to language teaching. It stems more from the idea that linguists seem to deny certain cultural values that teachers have long cherished.

There is an old adage that it takes two to make a quarrel, and the passive but massive resistance of many educational practitioners to change is legendary. It is not to be wondered at that this attitude is highly frustrating to the social reformers. Wolcott (146) comments on the traditional position of school people:

> Educators characteristically assume more responsibility for reform than the educational institution can accommodate, and their very commitment to the efficacy of formal instruction may preclude their ability to recognize its limits.
>
> The kind of assessment needed would require a program of recurring investigations and analyses by research teams whose members represent the perspectives of social scientists as well as schoolmen.

The literature reveals little of the thoughts or feelings or convictions of the educational practitioners at the operating level -- out "where the tire meets the road." School principals and classroom teachers rarely write for publication. Those educationists who do write are usually in supervisory positions and so may tend to be somewhat theoretical themselves. Thus, if a school administrator or a classroom teacher were convinced that a certain theoretical approach to teaching was invalid or impractical, he probably would not say so, he simply would not do it. And yet, occasionally, the literature gives us a glimpse at how practitioners feel. Poston (106), reporting on a seminar on Indian education held in one Arizona public school district, quotes a participant as saying, "We always come up with the idea that Indian students are no different than any other students. Yet the first thing we say is that we ought to treat them differently than other students. It seems to be an incongruity here."

Another seminar member said, "Perhaps we do too much for these Indian students. We have many more Mexican-American students and do nothing special for them." There is no intent to imply that these attitudes are typical, but they suggest that some teachers have not moved very far in their understanding of the problem.

Now the White House has said that Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has yielded disappointing results in removing the educational disadvantages of the children of the poor, and so the educationist's rather fundamental belief in the efficacy of compensatory education is being challenged.

Controversy at Rough Rock Demonstration School

A revealing, although somewhat distressing, example of the dislocation which can occur between theory and practice and the difficulty of testing out theory is the controversy which has developed about the Rough Rock Demonstration School.

There have been occasional references to the school earlier, but a brief word about its history is necessary. In 1966, a new elementary boarding school on the Navajo Reservation, built by the BIA but not yet occupied, was contracted out to a small corporation of Navajo tribal members (Dinè, Inc.) for operation. The purpose of this arrangement was to provide a setting for an innovative educational experience featuring bicultural education, bilingual education, Navajo community control of the school, and community development including adult education and a free interaction between the school and community -- an objective in which the U. S. Office of Economic Opportunity had a strong interest. The BIA provided the school plant and operating funds which it would have used if it had operated the school itself. An equal or somewhat larger amount was provided by the Office of Economic Opportunity for innovative demonstration programs. It was agreed that the school would be completely free of control by the BIA. The Dinè corporation hired as director a man long interested in the objectives of the project and he, in turn, recruited a staff. An all-Navajo board of education was elected from the Rough Rock community with the understanding that it would have effective decision-making powers concerning the school.

During the next two years the school received a tremendous amount of favorable, not to say laudatory, publicity, nationally as well as locally, ranging from magazine articles and television documentaries to statements by United States senators. In 1968, as was its practice, the Office of Economic Opportunity arranged for an evaluation of the school program; the contract was awarded to Dr. Donald A. Erickson (42), Associate Professor of Education at the University of Chicago, who appointed as his assistant Henrietta Schwartz, a research assistant at the University of Chicago and an experienced classroom teacher.

Erickson approached his task with complete sympathy for the objectives of the school. Nevertheless, he must have known that, considering the almost adulatory attitude of many important people toward the school, his and Mrs. Schwartz' job would not be easy if the evaluation was to be objective. To the present writer, the observation and documentation techniques used seem to have been exemplary. The report Erickson finally rendered to the Office of Economic Opportunity is a voluminous one, totaling over 300 pages, but only a few of the findings can be cited here. Erickson approved of much that he found. In the field of community relations, an area of greatest importance in the scheme of the school, he found that important strides had been made toward achieving community control at Rough Rock -- board members were exceptionally well known in the community, were believed to be genuinely in control of the school, and were viewed by at least one-half of the parents as responsive to community opinion. The school was a remarkably focal community institution. Contacts between classroom and home were frequent; nearly one-half of the parents had participated in adult education classes; and most of them felt the school was rather well attuned to their wishes.

But Erickson also concluded that many things were not working out as intended. The school board was not making substantive decisions about the classroom and dormitory programs or the hiring and firing of professional personnel but was spending much of its time administering a sort of patronage system with non-professional jobs, which included considerable nepotism. He concluded that there was little voluntary service or participation by anyone in the community -- that the board members were receiving a higher stipend than was warranted and that adults were being paid even for participating in arts-and-crafts classes. In all, at least one-half of the community members were on the school payroll at one time or the other in a kind of rotating system which contributed little to a permanent solution of the community's economic problems.

The evaluators felt that there was a weakness in supervision of the dormitories resulting in a "nonprogram." Consequently, the dormitories were, to a great extent, punishment-centered. There were cases of actual neglect of students who were ill and of run-away students who were not missed for considerable periods of time because of inadequate accounting procedures. In addition, there was a high anxiety level among students.

In the classrooms, there was some good teaching, particularly by some Navajo teachers; however, there was evidence of lack of coordinated planning in the instructional program. Also, there was no evidence that such programs as bilingual instruction had resulted in better command of English or other basic skills, as measured by standardized tests. Perhaps most shattering of all was the finding that the BIA's Rock Point School, operating under a progressive principal and staff but within the structure of the Federal bureaucracy, was doing as well or better in many areas, and that, so far as conventional classroom learning was concerned, pupils in the BIA's "run-of-the-mill" Chinle Boarding School were doing about as well.

The reaction of several of the members of Erickson's advisory committee to his preliminary findings was explosive. Before his final report was completed, the committee had issued a rebuttal. (The present writer read the latter document some time before he could secure a copy of Erickson's report.) The rebuttal document (16) has now been published and is being disseminated by two social scientists at the University of Minnesota. Basically, it alleges that Professor Erickson and Mrs. Schwartz, being unfamiliar with Navajo culture, experienced "culture shock" which led them to erroneous conclusions.

One explanation of this rather strange series of events is that all of the social theory about educating Indian children came to a focus at Rough Rock in a kind of laboratory situation. An evaluative finding that there were serious deficiencies in the way the theory was working out was an intolerable conclusion so far as some persons were concerned. It seems to the present writer that this reaction was immoderate. Erickson's findings do not invalidate the social theory, nor did he intend that they should. As he points out, a new Navajo administrator at the school, by making necessary adjustments, has already improved the program greatly. What the experience probably shows more than anything is that running an Indian boarding school under the best of circumstances is a difficult job.

The Boarding School as an Issue

It may be inaccurate to refer to that ancient institution, the Indian boarding school, as an issue. An examination of the literature would seem to indicate so, for it receives scant attention there. By scraping all references together, a mere ten writers even mention the subject. Furthermore, the boarding school has no staunch defender pleading its cause, not even the BIA which operates most of the boarding schools.

The BIA (*), in a communication to the Senate Subcommittee on Indian Education, referred to the boarding school as "a necessary but not a preferred way of educating children." Most Indian parents appear to have accepted such schools on that basis. And yet the boarding school is a large factor in the education of Indian Americans. In 1968 (29), some 35,000 Indian students were enrolled in 77 BIA boarding schools, of which about 20 were located away from the reservations. Another 4,000 Indian youngsters lived in BIA dormitories and attended public schools in 18 non-reservation communities. Several thousand other Indian students lived in dormitories operated by church or private groups.

Of those writers who did take note of boarding schools, Salisbury (115) criticizes them for being regimented and not allowing pupils to make their own mistakes and grow up. Gaarder (46) says that "Indian children should preferably not be put in boarding school, and *in no case should children of different language groups be put together in such schools*. (Emphasis added.)

LaVallee (69), reporting on a Canadian conference on Indian and Northern education, quotes a Hattie Ferguson as saying that she was educated in a residential school and got a very good education but that she does not favor the residential school because of the disruption caused in home and family life.

The Canadian Welfare Council (45), in a report to the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, filed a rather comprehensive list of criticisms of residential schools. Among them it was noted that these schools had an adverse effect upon children's personalities; that the schools were regimented and institutionalized and provided custodial rather than child development services; and that the residential schools had lost touch with the Indian reserves from which the pupils came and were not too well in touch with the communities in which they were located. The report called for an upgrading of professional staff.

The findings in the report bear great similarity to the findings of the Senate Subcommittee on Indian Education (134), which expressed particular concern about the fact that 9,000 Indian children below 10 years of age were enrolled in boarding schools and which insisted that arrangements for the education of these younger children in day schools be made at the earliest possible moment. (More than 90 percent of the younger children in boarding schools are on the Navajo Reservation.)

The continuing importance of boarding schools is commented on by Kelly (67), who reported that 18 percent of the Papago and Pima-Maricopa students (mostly in the upper grades) were attending either Federal or mission boarding schools. Lekanof (70) accepted the idea that some kind of boarding school arrangement is unavoidable for Alaskan native high school students but suggests that more small boarding high schools be built closer to the students' homes.

Not all of the comments about boarding schools are critical. Poehlman (103) stated that there are certain special advantages for Indian students who attend boarding schools: a greater variety of courses (including music, art, and vocational training), as well as guidance and health services. Poehlman also mentioned superior study facilities to those provided by most homes, many of which do not have electric lights. Brophy and Aberle (21) concluded that

> The . . . federal boarding schools are vital for beginning students several years late in enrolling, orphans, those from non-English speaking families, the academically retarded, or dropouts from public schools or those having special problems or needing vocational training that public schools are not equipped to handle.

Greene (51)(52), of New Mexico Highlands University, prepared progress reports in 1964 and 1965 of a study (funded by the National Institute of Mental Health) of psychosocial adjustment in an Indian boarding school. Unfortunately, a final report of the project does not appear to be available. Understandably, there were few conclusions reached in the progress reports, although the author did discuss the difficulty of securing referral of cases needing help, either in the nature of self-referral or by school staff. He mentioned the lack of flow of information about students among responsible school staff, as well as the school's strong emphasis on rules which resulted in symptomatic behavior being viewed by the school, usually, in disciplinary terms.

Probably the strongest residual support for boarding schools exists among Indian people, many of whom are alumni or former students of such schools. To many non-Indian persons, however, including some influential "Indian interest organizations," boarding schools are an anathema. A number of psychiatrists and pediatricians have spoken out against them. Few, if any, persons are comfortable with the idea of young children living in boarding schools.

If the Indian boarding school is not a strong issue with many people, it at least continues to pose a problem. What are the viable alternatives to the boarding school, particularly for children who live in remote and sparsely settled areas such as the Navajo Reservation or, in the case of rural Alaska, small but widely separated villages where an elementary school is feasible but a high school does not appear to be? For example, can an adequate system of all-weather roads be built on the Navajo Reservation in the foreseeable future?

The issue, or the problem, of the Indian boarding school is interlocked with the questions of integrated education and the Indian voice which will be discussed next.

The Issue of the Education of Indian Children in Integrated Public Schools

Again, it may seem inappropriate to characterize the education of Indian children in integrated public schools as an issue. The climate of opinion following the Supreme Court decision of 1954, particularly in the northern part of the United States, did not encourage anyone, especially professional people, to raise an issue. As a consequence, during the decade of the 1950's, there was a large-scale transfer of Indian pupils from Federal to public schools and a large proportion of out-of-school Indian children were placed in public schools. There was also a sort of euphoric assumption that the fact of integration itself would solve all problems of Indian children. It is also a fact that Indian people were not always consulted before arrangements for transfer were made or, if they were, it was in a perfunctory way. However, at the beginning of the 1960's, the policy of the BIA changed; since that time, the concurrence of Indian people has been a prerequisite to transfer.

Indian people have often been slow to give their approval and, as a result, the pace of integration, although it continues, has slowed. That there is an issue involved is attested to by the fact that, within very recent years, civil rights authorities in Washington and various members of the Congress, as well as the general public, have called upon the BIA to explain why it does not believe it is in violation of the Civil Rights Act by operating segregated schools. The BIA has replied that it does not operate separate schools for Indians for the purpose of discriminating against them but rather to provide educational services for those Indian students who would not otherwise be served, or would not be served as well, and that it supposes the reason the question has not been raised in the courts is because Indian people do not believe that they are being discriminated against (*). The Senate Subcommittee on Indian Education (134) now makes a strong point in its report that Indian students should not be transferred to public schools without consent of the Indian community.

There is, of course, de facto segregation of Indian children in BIA schools, although there is a modicum of integration in some of them, and there is some de facto segregation of Indian students in public schools. If a school operates on an Indian reservation, making it a public school does not necessarily make it an integrated one. Nevertheless, the Coleman Report (33) found that, of all the ethnic groups in the study, the Indian students were the most highly integrated.

In general, those who have written on the subject approve of the education of Indian children and youths in integrated situations with children of other races, but often with a cautionary note. In 1956, Artichoker (4) attributed much of the lack of progress of Indian pupils to their attending segregated schools. Potts and Sizemore (107) said that the public schools help to foster integration of the Indian child with other children but cautioned that the public schools must see that all children have an equal opportunity to learn. Miller (83), in 1968, cautioned that "Educators in integrated public schools should recognize that Indian pupils have special needs and that the policy of treating all of the pupils, Indian or non-Indian, alike is not necessarily admirable." He said that Indian pupils transferring to public schools have particular difficulty and that such transfer, without adequate preparation, may do more harm than good.

Ten years earlier, Coombs (36) had sounded a similar warning:

> As Indian people become integrated with the non-Indian community around them, their children will attend the schools provided by that community. Furthermore, it seems logical to suppose that as Indian children associate daily with non-Indian children they will learn from them. This undoubtedly happens in most cases. The logic expressed above is not necessarily irrefutable in all cases, however. The social climate of the school to which the Indian child transfers needs to be hospitable and sympathetic. Teaching materials and methods need to be adapted to the needs of the Indian child if his needs are different from those of his non-Indian classmates. Otherwise he may be repelled by his school experience rather than helped by it.

In 1966, Coleman (33) said much the same thing about Negro children with equal applicability to Indians:

> An education in integrated schools can be expected to have major effects on attitudes toward members of other racial groups. At its best, it can develop attitudes appropriate to the integrated society these students will live in; at its worst, it can create hostile camps of Negroes and whites in the same school. Thus, there is more to "school integration" than merely putting Negroes and whites in the same building, and there may be more important consequences of integration than its effect on achievement.

Why should this be so? Woods (147) quotes a Minnesota Indian youth as saying, "All Indians feel inferior to other people; in an all-Indian school you don't need to feel inferior." While this youth may have overstated the point, he no doubt expressed the feelings of many other Indian youths. Anderson and Safar (145), in a study of two multicultural communities, found that performance of Indian pupils was not as high as a measurement of their ability would lead one to expect. A study in the same communities (144) showed that community members, including teachers, believed Indian pupils to have the least ability of any of the three ethnic groups. Still another study by Anderson and Safar (1) concluded that the school programs offered in the two communities did not meet the unusual needs of Indian students.

Two other references give a clue to the standard prescription which many public schools have for curing the Indian pupil's problems. Poston (106) reports a consensus in a public school seminar on Indian education that, as soon as possible, Indian students should be dispersed so that there are two or three to a classroom. And Howe (61), reporting on Title I programs in San Juan County School District in Utah, notes that a ratio of five Navajos to fifteen Anglos is best for helping Navajos acquire "behavior patterns of the whites." When there are more Indian students, the "Indians mingle with one another and do not relate well to the other children."

The Issue of Indian Control of Schools and Related Problems

In the context of the American public school traditions, the proposition that Indians should control the schools which their children attend presents no issue at all. The situation, of course, is not that simple. Leaving aside mission and private schools -- attendance at which is a matter of personal choice -- three kinds of schools for Indian children are involved: Federal, public, and tribal. Each type presents constraints on Indian control.

Federal schools operated by the BIA are authorized by Federal law and funded by congressional appropriations. Employees of the BIA are Federal civil servants and, as such, are possessed of certain rights guaranteed to them by law. Under these conditions, while Indian communities can, and in many cases do, exercise some influence through advisory school boards, they do not and probably cannot exercise "control" in the ultimate decision-making and "hiring and firing" sense.

Public schools, organized under the laws of the states in which they are located, enroll at least two-thirds of the Indian children in the country. These schools operate under control of elected boards of education which, presumably, represent all residents of the school district. In a few public school districts, as for example five Arizona districts on the Navajo Reservation, Indian people are a majority, sometimes a large one. They can and usually do, elect a majority of Indians to the school board, but not always, whether because of diffidence or other reasons. It is more usual, however, for Indians to be a minority group in the public school situation -- and sometimes a very small minority indeed. In such cases, Indians are not often elected to school boards, although it can happen.

Kelly (67) points out that in Arizona there were 56 public schools with one to four Indian students each, 41 with five to ten, and 40 with eleven to twenty. Some 137 schools thus enroll twenty or fewer Indian students each, and the number of Indian students (totaling 958) was 16.4 percent of all enrolled pupils in the schools. The BIA (*) estimates that the approximately 63,000 Indian students for whom it provides Johnson-O'Malley support comprise only about 10 percent of the total enrollment of the public schools which they attend. In the case of "border-town" schools in which the parents are not even residents of the community, there is nc opportunity at all for Indian control.

Tribal schools are former BIA schools operated by tribal groups, school boards, or corporations under a contract with the BIA (as in the case of the Rough Rock Demonstration School). It may be wondered why there have not been more Rough Rocks. There appear to be several reasons -- some understandable, some not so well understood.

A former commissioner's legal problems in contracting out schools was described in the preceding chapter. This, however, is not the prime difficulty, for contracts with incorporated tribes or corporations composed of tribal members are still possible. A plan for operation of the BIA's Loneman Day School on the Pine Ridge Sioux Reservation by an Indian corporation called ONATE was well advanced (*) when a plebiscite of the tribal membership rejected the idea. Such developments are often explained as "tribal politics" or "fear of termination," but it seems evident that a better understanding of Indian attitudes on this question needs to be developed. There does not seem to be a groundswell of interest on the part of Indian communities in operating schools. Actually, tribal schools probably are feasible only in communities which are overwhelmingly Indian.

Another problem is that while in a single situation such as Rough Rock -- by a concentration of extraordinary funding, staff recruiting, and publicity -- a viable organization can be developed, small schools normally need the support of a larger organization such as a state department of education, for curriculum development, materials preparation, teacher procurement, and so forth. While it might be possible for tribal schools to receive such help from either state departments or the BIA, the image of "local control" would be somewhat eroded.

Problems Related to Obtaining Specially Prepared Teachers

Probably few persons would contend that it would not be preferable for teachers of Indian children to be sensitive and sympathetic to their cultural differences, to know something about their history, and, ideally, to have some familiarity with their native language. Under present conditions of teacher procurement, it is not likely that many such teachers will become available in either public or Federal schools.

Each year, the BIA (*) must replace about one-fourth of its teaching force of 2,400 members. The BIA recruits teachers from all over the country within the framework of the Civil Service system, which involves a twelve-month work year and an indefinite continuing appointment. Public schools also must recruit widely, although they place their teachers under contract, usually one year at a time. It has been suggested that BIA teachers be removed from Civil Service and placed under contract for a nine- or ten-month period, as are public school teachers.

In any case, it is inevitable that a large proportion of both public and BIA teachers of Indian children will embark upon their task knowing little of the problems which have filled the preceding pages. Indeed, many public school teachers will have only a minority of Indian children in a predominantly Anglo classroom.

It has been seen that an effort is being made to provide orientation and inservice training for teachers, but many persons are becoming convinced that only a far longer period of preservice education can hope to do the job. If this idea is to be effectuated, it will require not only finding a relatively large number of future teachers willing to make a fairly long-term commitment but also working out arrangements between school officials and the teacher education departments of colleges and universities for their training and employment. There seems to be general agreement that more of the teachers should themselves be Indians, but no one seems to have given much thought to what an optimum proportion would be -- whether 100 percent or 20 percent or somewhere between.

A study of teacher mobility and retention in both public and Federal schools enrolling Indians, now being carried out by the University of Oklahoma Research Institute under U. S. Office of Education funding, should shed light on the problem, but the study does not promise to provide final answers.

Problems Related to Bilingual Education

Although the necessity for programs of English as a second language has been accepted, generally, on the Navajo Reservation and in Alaska, and perhaps among the Choctaw students in Mississippi, not much has been done elsewhere. In fact, it is not entirely clear what can be done, for example, among the Sioux of South Dakota or the Cherokee of eastern Oklahoma. While, undoubtedly, many such Indian children begin school with a limited knowledge of English or speaking a non-standard variety of it, there has been a great deal of "checkerboarding" of white settlement among the Indians of these areas and most of the children are in integrated public schools.

Also, while the BIA has committed itself to pilot experimental projects in initial instruction in the native language on both the Navajo Reservation and in Alaska, the logistical problems of expanding such an effort, should the projects be successful, will be formidable in terms of securing qualified teachers and sufficient instructional material. It is not even certain that the sentiment in all-Indian or all-Eskimo communities toward such an effort would be favorable.

Chapter 7

CONCLUDING REMARKS

As can be seen, the issues and problems facing Indian education are numerous and challenging. The Southwest Cooperative Educational Laboratory, with a grant from the U. S. Office of Education, has called in a group of persons, expert in the field, who are addressing themselves to two questions: (a) Where is our knowledge base broad enough, or where do knowledge gaps exist, concerning the educational problems of Indian Americans? and (b) Since our knowledge is adequate in particular areas, what developmental activities can be initiated concerning the problems of Indian Americans?

Finally, the National Study of American Indian Education (57), under the direction of Robert J. Havighurst, is scheduled for completion by the end of 1970. Certain components of the study, to be reported on earlier, will include a status survey of Indian education by Herbert Aurbach and Estelle Fuchs, which will provide much useful statistical and demographic information, and preliminary papers on Indian education in urban centers. This latter area of concern, which is only now getting attention, has been touched on in the earlier chapters of this volume, largely through the studies of Harkins and Woods at the University of Minnesota.

The main body of the Havighurst report will deal with many of the issues and problems discussed in this and the preceding chapters: the perceptions which Indian youths have of themselves and their schools, the perceptions of teachers concerning Indian students, and how Indian parents and tribal leaders feel about their schools, to name only a few.

The Indian American student is educationally disadvantaged -- there is no question about that. In the foregoing discussions, we have tried to show that while much remains to be done, progress is being made. In the decade of the 1960's, America discovered its educationally disadvantaged children. It is to be hoped that in the decade of the 1970's, with a mounting preoccupation for saving our environment, we shall not again lose sight of them.

REFERENCES*

1. Anderson, James G. and Safar, Dwight. EQUALITY OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY FOR SPANISH-AMERICAN AND INDIAN STUDENTS IN TWO MULTI-CULTURAL COMMUNITIES: AN EXPLORATORY ASSESSMENT. New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, Jan. 1969 (ED 029 746).

2. Arizona State Educational Agency. STATE OF ARIZONA ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT, FISCAL YEAR 1967, TITLE I, P.L. 89-10, ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965. Phoenix, 1967 (ED 017 613).

3. Arizona State University, Bureau of Educational Research and Services. NEW HORIZONS FOR INDIAN EDUCATION. ANNUAL (NINTH) AMERICAN INDIAN EDUCATION CONFERENCE. Tempe, 1968 (ED 027 981).

4. Artichoker, John, Jr. INDIANS OF SOUTH DAKOTA. South Dakota State Department of Public Instruction, Pierre, 1956 (ED 011 467).

5. Ashe, Robert W. SURVEY REPORT -- NAVAJO COMMUNITY COLLEGE. Arizona State University (College of Education), Tempe, 1966 (ED 017 229).

6. Aurbach, Herbert A. (ed.). PROCEEDINGS OF THE NATIONAL RESEARCH CONFERENCE ON AMERICAN INDIAN EDUCATION. Society for the Study of Social Problems, Kalamazoo, Michigan; Pennsylvania State University, University Park, 1967 (ED 018 287).

7. AVCO Economic Systems Corporation. THE PREPARATION OF BIA TEACHER AND DORMITORY AIDES, VOL. I. Washington, D.C., 1968 (ED 031 330).

8. Bass, Willard P. THE AMERICAN INDIAN HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE IN THE SOUTHWEST. Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory, Inc., Albuquerque, New Mexico, 1969 (ED 031 362).

9. Bass, Willard P. AN ANALYSIS OF ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT OF INDIAN HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS IN FEDERAL AND PUBLIC SCHOOLS - A FIRST YEAR PROGRESS REPORT. Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory, Inc., Albuquerque, New Mexico, 1968.

---

*Citations followed by an ED number may be ordered, by ED number, from ERIC Document Reproduction Service in hard copy and/or microfiche. See ERIC's monthly publication, Research in Education, for additional ordering information.

10. Bass, Willard P. AN ANALYSIS OF ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT OF INDIAN HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS IN FEDERAL AND PUBLIC SCHOOLS - A SECOND YEAR PROGRESS REPORT. Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory, Inc., Albuquerque, New Mexico, 1969.

11. Bass, Willard P. and Burger, Henry G. AMERICAN INDIANS AND EDUCATIONAL LABORATORIES. Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory, Inc., Albuquerque, New Mexico, 1967 (ED 014 369).

12. Bauer, Evelyn. BILINGUAL EDUCATION IN BIA SCHOOLS (Paper given at the Third Annual TESOL Convention, Chicago, Illinois, March 5-8, 1969). Bureau of Indian Affairs, Washington, D.C., 1969 (ED 030 089).

13. Bee, Robert L. AN APPRAISAL OF POSSIBILITIES FOR A HEAD START PROGRAM AMONG THE POTAWATOMI INDIANS OF KANSAS. INDIAN COMMUNITIES AND PROJECT HEAD START (Part of the total report, "Indian Communities and Project Head Start--Summary and Observations in the Dakotas and Minnesota"), 1965 (ED 013 671).

14. Bentzen, Frances. AN INTERDISCIPLINARY APPROACH IN THE IDENTIFICATION OF MENTALLY RETARDED INDIAN CHILDREN. PILOT STUDY. Bureau of Indian Affairs, Washington, D.C., 1965 (ED 011 726).

15. Bentzen, Frances. AN INTERDISCIPLINARY APPROACH IN THE IDENTIFICATION OF MENTALLY RETARDED INDIAN CHILDREN. ADDENDUM. Bureau of Indian Affairs, Washington, D.C., 1966 (ED 011 804).

16. Bergman, Robert; Muskrat, Joseph; Tax, Sol; Werner, Oswald; and Witherspoon, Gary. Harkins, Arthur and Woods, Richard (eds.). PROBLEMS OF CROSSCULTURAL EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND EVALUATION: THE ROUGH ROCK DEMONSTRATION SCHOOL. Training Center for Community Programs in Coordination with the Office of Community Programs Center for Urban and Regional Affairs. University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, 1970.

17. Berman, Mark L. SOME CONSIDERATIONS IN THE EDUCATION OF INDIGENOUS GROUPS IN THE SOUTHWEST. Systems Development Corporation, Santa Monica, California, 1965 (ED 016 387).

18. Bernardoni, Louis C. et al. SUCCESSFUL TEACHER PRACTICES IN THE TEACHING OF INDIAN YOUNGSTERS. Arizona State Department of Public Instruction, Phoenix, 1961 (ED 011 214).

19. Bernardoni, Louis C. et al. ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE CO-ORDINATING COUNCIL FOR RESEARCH IN INDIAN EDUCATION (April 12-13, 1962). Maunelle Martin, Contributor. Arizona State Department of Public Instruction, Phoenix, 1962 (ED 012 631).

20. Berry, Brewton. THE EDUCATION OF THE AMERICAN INDIANS: A SURVEY OF THE LITERATURE. Ohio State University, Columbus; U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1968 (ED 026 545).

21. Brophy, William A. and Aberle, Sophie, D. THE INDIAN, AMERICA'S UNFINISHED BUSINESS; THE CIVILIZATION OF THE AMERICAN INDIAN SERIES, VOL. 83. Commission on the Rights, Liberties and Responsibilities of the American Indian, Albuquerque, New Mexico; University of Oklahoma Press, Norman, 1966.

22. Bryde, John F. NEW APPROACH TO INDIAN EDUCATION. Holy Rosary Mission, Pine Ridge, South Dakota, 1967 (ED 015 818).

23. Bryde, John F. THE SIOUX INDIAN STUDENT -- A STUDY OF SCHOLASTIC FAILURE AND PERSONALITY CONFLICT. 1966 (ED 018 289).

24. Buckley, Helen et al. THE INDIANS AND METIS OF NORTHERN SASKATCHEWAN. A REPORT ON ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT. Canadian Centre for Community Studies, Saskatoon, 1963.

25. Bureau of the Census. UNITED STATES CENSUS OF POPULATION, 1960. NON-WHITE POPULATION. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

26. Bureau of Indian Affairs. ANSWERS TO YOUR QUESTIONS ABOUT AMERICAN INDIANS. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1968 (ED 025 353).

27. Bureau of Indian Affairs. BASIC GOALS FOR ELEMENTARY CHILDREN: VOLUME I, BEGINNERS LEVEL AND LEVEL ONE; VOLUME II, LEVELS TWO AND THREE; VOLUME III, LEVELS FOUR, FIVE, AND SIX; VOLUME IV, LEVELS SEVEN AND EIGHT. Publications Service, Haskell Institute, Lawrence, Kansas, 1966 (ED 024 477).

28. Bureau of Indian Affairs. LITTLE HERDER READING SERIES. Publications Service, Haskell Institute, Lawrence, Kansas, 1965 (ED 022 617).

29. Bureau of Indian Affairs. STATISTICS CONCERNING INDIAN EDUCATION, FISCAL YEAR 1968. Washington, D.C., 1968.

30. Burger, Henry G. "ETHNO-PEDAGOGY": A MANUAL IN CULTURAL SENSITIVITY, WITH TECHNIQUES FOR IMPROVING CROSS-CULTURAL TEACHING BY FITTING ETHNIC PATTERNS. SECOND EDITION. Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory, Albuquerque, New Mexico, 1968 (ED 024 653).

31. Cata, Juanita. THE NAVAJO SOCIAL STUDIES PROJECT. University of New Mexico (College of Education), Albuquerque, 1968 (ED 025 346).

32. Center for Applied Linguistics. STYLES OF LEARNING AMONG AMERICAN INDIANS. AN OUTLINE FOR RESEARCH. REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF A CONFERENCE HELD AT STANFORD UNIVERSITY AUGUST 8-10, 1968. Washington, D.C., 1968.

33. Coleman, James S. et al. EQUALITY OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY. U. S. Office of Education, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1966.

34. Commissioner of Indian Affairs. THE NAVAJO BORDERTOWN DORMITORY PROGRAM. A REPORT TO THE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE BY THE COMMISSIONER OF INDIAN AFFAIRS. Bureau of Indian Affairs, Washington, D.C., 1965 (ED 024 490).

35. Coombs, L. Madison. DOORWAY TOWARD THE LIGHT, THE STORY OF THE SPECIAL NAVAJO EDUCATION PROGRAM. Bureau of Indian Affairs, Washington, D.C., 1962 (ED 024 491).

36. Coombs, L. Madison et al. THE INDIAN CHILD GOES TO SCHOOL, A STUDY OF INTERRACIAL DIFFERENCES. Bureau of Indian Affairs, Washington, D.C., 1958 (ED 024 508).

37. Crawford, Dean A. et al. MINNESOTA CHIPPEWA INDIANS, A HANDBOOK FOR TEACHERS. Upper Midwest Regional Educational Laboratory, Inc., St. Paul, Minnesota, 1967 (ED 017 383).

38. Davey, R. F. et al. THE EDUCATION OF INDIAN CHILDREN IN CANADA. A SYMPOSIUM WRITTEN BY MEMBERS OF INDIAN AFFAIRS EDUCATION DIVISION, WITH COMMENTS BY THE INDIAN PEOPLES. THE CANADIAN SUPERINTENDENT 1965. Canadian Association of School Superintendents and Inspectors, Ottawa, Ontario, 1965.

39. Digneo, Ellen Hartnett and Shaya, Tila (eds.). THE MIAMI LINGUISTIC READING PROGRAM 1965-68. REPORT. New Mexico Western States Small Schools Project, Santa Fe, Aug. 1968 (ED 029 724).

40. Edington, Everett D. ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT OF AMERICAN INDIAN STUDENTS--REVIEW OF RECENT RESEARCH (A paper presented at the Rural Sociological Society Meeting, San Francisco, California, Aug. 28-31, 1969) (ED 032 168).

41. Edington, Everett D. and Hocker, Phillip. DEVELOPMENT OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR AMERICAN INDIANS (Conference proceedings, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, Aug. 18-22, 1969).
Remarks by Henry A. Wall.
ERIC/CRESS, New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, Oct. 1969 (ED 031 614).

42. Erickson, Donald A. and Schwartz, Henrietta (with a Special Report by Oswald Werner). COMMUNITY SCHOOL AT ROUGH ROCK, A REPORT SUBMITTED TO THE OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY. Apr. 1969.

43. Ferris, Robert G. (ed.). THE INDIANS OF NEW MEXICO: APACHE, NAVAJO, PUEBLO, UTE. Museum of New Mexico Press, Santa Fe, 1963 (ED 024 518).

44. Forbes, Jack D. CALIFORNIA INDIAN EDUCATION, REPORT OF THE FIRST ALL-INDIAN STATEWIDE CONFERENCE ON CALIFORNIA INDIAN EDUCATION. Ad Hoc Committee on California Indian Education, 1967 (ED 017 391).

45. French, Doris. INDIAN RESIDENTIAL SCHOOLS. A RESEARCH STUDY OF THE CHILD CARE PROGRAMS OF NINE RESIDENTIAL SCHOOLS IN SASKATCHEWAN. Canadian Welfare Council, Ottawa, 1967 (ED 027 989).

46. Gaarder, Bruce. EDUCATION OF AMERICAN INDIAN CHILDREN (Report presented at the Annual Conference of the Southwest Council of Foreign Language Teachers, El Paso, Texas, Nov. 10-11, 1967) (ED 018 299).

47. Gaarder, Bruce. TESTIMONY BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES. Washington, D.C., June 1967.

48. Garber, Malcolm. CLASSROOM STRATEGIES: CULTURE AND LEARNING STYLES. VOLUME I. Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory, Inc., Albuquerque, New Mexico, 1968 (ED 025 364).

49. Gardner, R. C. A SURVEY OF ATTITUDES OF EDUCATORS OF AMERICAN INDIAN CHILDREN (Research Bulletin No. 66. Department of Psychology, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario). Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D.C., 1967.

50. Greenburg, Norman C. and Greenburg, Gilda M. EDUCATION OF THE AMERICAN INDIAN IN TODAY'S WORLD, AN INTERDISCIPLINARY APPROACH FOR TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS.
William H. Kelly, contributor.
Wm. C. Brown Book Co., Dubuque, Iowa, 1964.

51. Greene, Joel E. PSYCHO-SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT IN AN INDIAN BOARDING SCHOOL, SEPTEMBER 1, 1963-AUGUST 31, 1964. PROGRESS REPORT. New Mexico Highlands University, Las Vegas, 1964 (ED 027 985).

52. Greene, Joel E. PSYCHO-SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT IN AN INDIAN BOARDING SCHOOL, SEPTEMBER 1, 1964-AUGUST 31, 1965. PROGRESS REPORT. New Mexico Highlands University, Las Vegas, 1965 (ED 028 006).

53. Groesbeck, Hulda. A PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL READING PROGRAM FOR RESERVATION INDIAN CHILDREN IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS OF NORTHERN ARIZONA. Northern Arizona Supplementary Education Center, Flagstaff, 1968.

54. Haglund, E. A. INDIAN INTEGRATION IN NEVADA PUBLIC SCHOOLS. Nevada State Department of Education, Carson City, 1966 (ED 010 751).

55. Harkins, Arthur M. PUBLIC EDUCATION ON A MINNESOTA CHIPPEWA RESERVATION. VOLUMES 1-6. FINAL REPORT. University of Kansas, Lawrence, 1968 (ED 025 338).

56. Harkins, Arthur M. and Woods, Richard G. EDUCATION RELATED PREFERENCES AND CHARACTERISTICS OF COLLEGE-ASPIRING URBAN INDIAN TEENAGERS: A PRELIMINARY REPORT. Minneapolis Training Center for Community Programs, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, 1969 (ED 030 514).

57. Havighurst, Robert J. THE NATIONAL STUDY OF AMERICAN INDIAN EDUCATION. University of Chicago under contract with the U.S. Office of Education. (Expected completion date, Dec. 1970.)

58. Hinckley, Edward C. INDIAN PARTICIPATION IN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS (ED 011 787).

59. Hoffman, Virginia. ORAL ENGLISH AT ROUGH ROCK; A NEW PROGRAM FOR NAVAJO CHILDREN. Navajo Curriculum Center, Rough Rock Demonstration School, Chinle, Arizona, 1968.

60. Holland, Nora. A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY ON THE EDUCATION OF URBAN AMERICAN INDIAN AND MEXICAN-AMERICAN CHILDREN. ERIC Clearinghouse on the Urban Disadvantaged, Columbia University, New York, Apr. 1969 (ED 029 935).

61. Howe, Elliot C. PROGRAMS FOR BILINGUAL STUDENTS OF UTAH (Report presented at the Annual Conference of the Southwest Council of Foreign Language Teachers, El Paso, Texas, Nov. 10-11, 1967) (ED 017 389).

62. Howe, Harold, II. TESTIMONY BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES. Washington, D.C., June 1967.

63. Idaho State Department of Education. THERE'S AN INDIAN IN YOUR CLASSROOM. Boise, Idaho, 1968 (ED 031 331).

64. Johnson, Broderick H. NAVAJO EDUCATION AT ROUGH ROCK. Rough Rock Demonstration School, Rough Rock Rural Branch, Chinle, Arizona, 1968.

65. Johnson, Lyndon B. THE FORGOTTEN AMERICAN - MESSAGE TO THE CONGRESS ON GOALS AND PROGRAMS FOR THE AMERICAN INDIAN, MARCH 6, 1968 (ED 024 500).

66. Keating, Charlotte Matthews. BUILDING BRIDGES OF UNDERSTANDING. Palo Verde Publishing Company, Inc., Tucson, Arizona, 1967.

67. Kelly, William H. A STUDY OF SOUTHERN ARIZONA SCHOOL-AGE INDIAN CHILDREN, 1966-1967. University of Arizona (Bureau of Ethnic Research), Tucson, 1967 (ED 024 485).

68. Lamberts, J. J. et al. TEACHING ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE. Arizona State Department of Public Instruction, Phoenix, 1962 (ED 019 154).

69. LaVallee, Mary Anne (ed.). NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON INDIAN AND NORTHERN EDUCATION. Society for Indian and Northern Problems, Saskatchewan University, Saskatoon, 1967 (ED 028 861).

70. Lekanof, Flore. A STUDY OF PROBLEMS IN EDUCATION OF THE NATIVE PEOPLE OF ALASKA (A paper submitted to the Alaska Federation of Natives in Support of the Alaska Native Land Claims Settlement, June 1968) (ED 029 736).

71. Lindemuth, Robert G. INDIAN EDUCATION. ANNUAL REPORT, 1967-68. Washington State Office of Public Instruction, Olympia, 1968 (ED 027 102).

72. Lopez, Rebecca. UNDERSTANDING--SANTO DOMINGO'S RX FOR THE "CULTURAL SHOCK." New Mexico School Review, Apr. 1967 (ED 016 554).

73. MacArthur, R. S. ASSESSING THE INTELLECTUAL ABILITY OF INDIAN AND METIS PUPILS AT FT. SIMPSON, N.W.T. Canadian Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources, Ottawa, Ontario, 1962 (ED 027 123).

74. MacArthur, R. S. LONGITUDINAL PREDICTION OF SCHOOL ACHIEVEMENT FOR METIS AND ESKIMO PUPILS (Paper presented to CCRE Conference on Educational Research, Winnipeg, Canada, June 1967) (ED 023 515).

75. Martinez, Cecilia and Heathman, James E. AMERICAN INDIAN EDUCATION, A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY. ERIC/CRESS, New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, 1969 (ED 030 780).

76. Mathiot, Madeleine. A STUDY OF METHOD IN LANGUAGE-AND-CULTURE RESEARCH. FINAL REPORT. Los Angeles, California, 1966 (ED 011 053).

77. Maynes, J. O., Jr. BILINGUAL EDUCATION IN ARIZONA. REPORT 3, BILINGUAL PROGRAMS IN THE SOUTHWEST (Report delivered at the Annual Conference of the Southwest Council of Foreign Language Teachers, El Paso, Texas, Nov. 10-11, 1967) (ED 017 385).

78. McGrath, G. D. et al. HIGHER EDUCATION OF SOUTHWESTERN INDIANS WITH REFERENCE TO SUCCESS AND FAILURE. Arizona State University (College of Education), Tempe, 1962 (ED 002 995).

79. McGrath, G. D. et al. INVESTIGATION OF MENTAL RETARDATION IN RELATION TO BILINGUAL AND SUBCULTURAL FACTORS. Arizona State University (College of Education), Tempe, 1960 (ED 002 810).

80. McKinley, Francis. FEDERAL INDIAN POLICY AS IT AFFECTS LOCAL INDIAN AFFAIRS (Address given at the annual meeting of the Indian Rights Association, May 12, 1964). Arizona State University, Tempe, 1964 (ED 010 965).

81. Mickelson, Norma I. and Galloway, Charles C. CUMULATIVE LANGUAGE DEFICIT AMONG INDIAN CHILDREN (Paper presented at the 7th Canadian Conference on Educational Research, Victoria, B.C., Jan. 1969). Canadian Council for Research in Education, Ottawa, 1969 (ED 030 864).

82. Miller, Harold J. INDIAN EDUCATION. University of North Dakota (College of Education), Grand Forks, 1966 (ED 014 346).

83. Miller, Harold J. THE EFFECTS OF INTEGRATION ON RURAL INDIAN PUPILS. FINAL REPORT. University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, 1968 (ED 022 964).

84. Miller, Mary Rita. TEACHING ENGLISH TO THE INDIAN OF THE PLAINS AND THE NORTHWEST (Article in TESOL Quarterly, vol. 2, no. 3, Sep. 1968). Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., 1968 (ED 025 748).

85. Moynihan, Daniel P. MAXIMUM FEASIBLE MISUNDERSTANDING - COMMUNITY ACTION IN THE WAR ON POVERTY. The Free Press, New York, 1969.

86. National Association for the Education of Young Children. A KINDERGARTEN CURRICULUM GUIDE FOR INDIAN CHILDREN: A BILINGUAL-BICULTURAL APPROACH. Washington, D.C., Sep. 1968 (ED 031 318).

87. National Council on Indian Opportunity. REPORT. Office of the Vice-President, Washington, D.C., Jan. 26, 1970.

88. Navajo Tribe Education Committee. TEACHING OF ENGLISH TO NAVAJO CHILDREN, ANNUAL CONFERENCE ON NAVAJO EDUCATION, UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO, JAN. 22-25, 1961. University of New Mexico, Albuquerque; Window Rock, Arizona, 1961 (ED 021 667).

89. Nix, Elmer. KEYS TO INDIAN EDUCATION. Arizona State University (College of Education), Tempe, 1962 (ED 017 349).

90. Northern Montana College. AN EPDA PROJECT TO PREPARE GRADUATE TEACHERS AND UNDERGRADUATE INDIAN TEACHER AIDES TO EDUCATE AMERICAN INDIAN CHILDREN. A PROPOSAL. Havre, Montana, 1969 (ED 032 279).

91. Office of Education, U.S. DIGEST OF EDUCATIONAL STATISTICS. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1968.

92. Ohannessian, Sirarpi. PLANNING CONFERENCE FOR A BILINGUAL KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM FOR NAVAJO CHILDREN. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS. Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D.C., Oct. 11-12, 1968.

93. Ohannessian, Sirarpi. THE STUDY OF THE PROBLEMS OF TEACHING ENGLISH TO AMERICAN INDIANS, REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS. Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D.C., 1967 (ED 014 727).

94. Oklahoma State University. PROJECT VISION: A FINAL REPORT. Bureau of Indian Affairs, Washington, D.C.; Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, July 1, 1968 (ED 030 525).

95. Olsen, Diane. INDIANS IN LITERATURE, A SELECTED ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR CHILDREN. University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, 1964 (ED 014 353).

96. Ortiz, Alfonso. PROJECT HEAD START IN AN INDIAN COMMUNITY. University of Chicago, Chicago, 1965 (ED 014 329).

97. Osborn, Lynn R. SPEECH COMMUNICATION AND THE AMERICAN INDIAN HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT. The Speech Teacher, vol. 17, Jan. 1968 (ED 018 425).

98. Owens, Charles S. THE DIVISION OF INDIAN EDUCATION OF THE NEW MEXICO STATE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION TO THE BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS. ANNUAL REPORT, 1966-67. New Mexico State Department of Education, Santa Fe, 1967 (ED 017 362).

99. Owens, Charles S. and Bass, Willard P. THE AMERICAN INDIAN HIGH SCHOOL DROPOUT IN THE SOUTHWEST. Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory, Inc., Albuquerque, New Mexico, 1969 (ED 026 195).

100. Parmee, Edward A. FORMAL EDUCATION AND CULTURE CHANGE, A MODERN APACHE INDIAN COMMUNITY AND GOVERNMENT EDUCATION PROGRAMS. University of Arizona Press, Tucson, 1968.

101. Paskewitz, Daniel and Stark, Matthew. PROJECT AWARENESS, UNIVERSITY-AMERICAN INDIAN EDUCATIONAL ENRICHMENT AND VOCATIONAL MOTIVATION PROGRAM. ANNUAL REPORT. University of Minnesota, St. Paul, 1967 (ED 024 495).

102. Poehlman, Charles. ANNUAL REPORT, 1965-66, TO UNITED STATES BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS. Nevada State Department of Education, Carson City, 1966 (ED 013 147).

103. Poehlman, C. H. *et al*. KNOW YOUR NEVADA INDIANS. Nevada State Department of Education, Carson City, 1966 (ED 011 219).

104. Poehlman, C. H. *et al*. THE PROBLEM OF AIDING TODAY'S INDIAN TEEN AGE STUDENT TO BE PREPARED FOR TOMORROW. Nevada State Department of Education, Carson City, 1964 (ED 010 749).

105. Poehlman, C. H. *et al*. SUGGESTED TECHNIQUES IN GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING WITH INDIAN YOUTH AND ADULTS. Nevada State Department of Education, Carson City, 1966 (ED 010 750).

106. Poston, William K., Jr. (ed.). TEACHING INDIAN PUPILS IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS. (PROCEEDINGS OF A SEMINAR, APRIL 27-MAY 2, 1967). Mesa Public Schools, Arizona, 1967 (ED 021 664).

107. Potts, Alfred M., 2nd and Sizemore, Mamie. DEVELOPING CURRICULUM FOR INDIAN CHILDREN. Adams State College, Alamosa, Colorado, 1964 (ED 012 188).

108. Pratt, Wayne T. TOWARD A BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF THE INDIAN AMERICAN (An extension of remarks given at the NAIRO Conference, San Francisco, California, Nov. 3, 1961) (ED 010 966).

109. Ray, Charles K. *et al*. ALASKA NATIVE SECONDARY SCHOOL DROPOUTS. University of Alaska, College, 1962 (ED 002 956).

110. Renaud, Andre. EDUCATION FROM WITHIN, AN EXPERIMENT IN CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT WITH CHILDREN OF INDIAN BACKGROUND IN SASKATCHEWAN (Paper presented at the Ontario Conference on Indian Affairs, London, Ontario, Nov. 1964) (ED 026 179).

111. Roessel, Robert A., Jr. EDUCATION FOR THE ADULT INDIAN COMMUNITY. Arizona State University (College of Education), Tempe, 1964 (ED 017 350).

112. Roessel, Robert A., Jr. THE RIGHT TO BE WRONG AND THE RIGHT TO BE RIGHT (Speech delivered at Annual Indian Education Conference, Tempe, Arizona, March 1967. Also appears in the *Journal of American Indian Education*, vol. 7, no. 2, Jan. 1968) (ED 017 382).

113. Roessel, Robert A., Jr. and Lee, Nicholas (eds.). INDIAN EDUCATION WORKSHOPS. PART I - EDUCATION OF INDIAN ADULTS. PART II - COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT IN INDIAN EDUCATION. Arizona State University (Indian Education Center), Tempe, 1962 (ED 017 855).

114. Salisbury, Lee H. ROLE CONFLICT IN NATIVE COMMUNICATION (Paper presented at the TESOL Convention in April of 1967) (ED 024 037).

115. Salisbury, Lee H. TEACHING ENGLISH TO ALASKA NATIVES (Paper delivered at TESOL Conference, New York City, March 17, 1966) (ED 016 557).

116. Selinger, Alphonse D. THE AMERICAN INDIAN GRADUATE: AFTER HIGH SCHOOL, WHAT? Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, Portland, Oregon, 1968 (ED 026 165).

117. Selinger, Alphonse D. THE AMERICAN INDIAN HIGH SCHOOL DROPOUT: THE MAGNITUDE OF THE PROBLEM. Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, Portland, Oregon, 1968 (ED 026 164).

118. Shoshone-Bannock Tribes. ENRICHMENT PROGRAM FOR THE CULTURALLY DIFFERENT CHILD. Fort Hall, Idaho, 1968 (ED 021 660).

119. Silvaroli, Nicholas and Zuchowski, John M. EDUCATING APACHE INDIAN CHILDREN IN A PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM. FINAL REPORT OF THE FORT THOMAS DIVERSE CAPACITY PROJECT. Western States Small Schools Project, Phoenix, Arizona, 1968 (ED 026 182).

120. Simpson, John W. EDUCATING THE DISADVANTAGED CHILD IN CLALLAM AND JEFFERSON COUNTIES, A REVIEW AND EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAMS ESTABLISHED IN NINE SCHOOL DISTRICTS. Clallam-Jefferson County Community Action Council, State of Washington, 1967 (ED 019 349).

121. Sizemore, Mamie. CLOSING THE GAP IN INDIAN EDUCATION. Arizona State Department of Public Instruction, Phoenix, 1967 (ED 011 475).

122. Sizemore, Mamie *et al*. COLORADO INDIAN EDUCATION WORKSHOP PAPERS. Adams State College, Alamosa, Colorado, 1964 (ED 012 193).

123. Smail, Herbert K. *et al*. SCHOOL CURRICULUM: A FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF LATHROP HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES AND DROPOUTS. Fairbanks North Star Borough School District, Fairbanks, Alaska, 1968.

124. Smith, Anne M. INDIAN EDUCATION IN NEW MEXICO. University of New Mexico (Division of Government Research), Albuquerque, 1968.

125. Smith, Anne M. NEW MEXICO INDIANS--ECONOMIC, EDUCATIONAL, AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS. Museum of New Mexico, Santa Fe, 1966 (ED 019 172).

126. Steere, Caryl *et al.* INDIAN TEACHER-AIDE HANDBOOK. Arizona State University (College of Education), Tempe, 1965 (ED 024 488).

127. Stone, Veda. THE INDIAN CHILD IN THE CLASSROOM (Article in the *Journal of American Indian Education*, vol. 3, no. 3, May 1964). Arizona State University (College of Education), Tempe, 1964 (ED 016 558).

128. Stout, Irving. WORKSHOP REPORT ON PARENT-COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT. Arizona State University, Tempe, June 1969 (ED 032 165).

129. Striner, Herbert E. TOWARD A FUNDAMENTAL PROGRAM FOR THE TRAINING, EMPLOYMENT, AND ECONOMIC EQUALITY OF THE AMERICAN INDIAN (An issue paper of limited circulation), 1967.

130. Thomas, Hadley A. THE TEACHER AIDE PROGRAM. Tuba City Elementary School, Tuba City, Arizona, 1968 (ED 027 996).

131. Thompson, Hildegard. EDUCATION FOR CROSS-CULTURAL ENRICHMENT, SELECTED ARTICLES FROM INDIAN EDUCATION, 1952-64. Bureau of Indian Affairs, Washington, D.C.; Publications Service, Haskell Institute, Lawrence, Kansas, 1964 (ED 021 654).

132. Ulibarri, Horacio. INTERPRETIVE STUDIES ON BILINGUAL EDUCATION -FINAL REPORT -U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION, BUREAU OF RESEARCH. University of New Mexico (College of Education), Albuquerque, 1969 (ED 028 428).

133. Ulibarri, Horacio and Holeman, Richard. ADMINISTRATION OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION. University of New Mexico (College of Education), Albuquerque, March 1969 (ED 028 429).

134. United States Senate, Special Subcommittee on Indian Education. INDIAN EDUCATION: A NATIONAL TRAGEDY -A NATIONAL CHALLENGE. Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1969.

135. Vaughan, Robert E. *et al.* QUALITY EDUCATION FOR AMERICAN INDIANS, A REPORT ON ORGANIZATIONAL LOCATION. U.S. Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Washington, D.C., 1967 (ED 024 501).

136. Vontress, Clemont E. CULTURAL DIFFERENCES: IMPLICATIONS FOR COUNSELING (Speech presented at the American Personnel and Guidance Association Convention, Detroit, Michigan, April 7-11, 1968). American Personnel and Guidance Association, Washington, D.C., 1968 (ED 023 105).

137. Wade, Jon C. INDIAN EDUCATION, STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA, JOHNSON-O'MALLEY PROGRAM, FISCAL 1966. FINAL REPORT. South Dakota State Department of Public Instruction, Pierre, 1966 (ED 013 132).

138. Wall, Leon and Morgan, William. NAVAJO-ENGLISH DICTIONARY. Bureau of Indian Affairs, Washington, D.C.; Publications Service, Haskell Institute, Lawrence, Kansas, 1958 (ED 022 618).

139. Wax, Murray. AMERICAN INDIAN EDUCATION AS A CULTURAL TRANSACTION (Article in *Teachers College Record*, vol. 65, no. 8, May 1963) (ED 013 124).

140. Wax, Murray *et al.* INDIAN EDUCATION IN EASTERN OKLAHOMA; A REPORT OF FIELDWORK AMONG THE CHEROKEES. University of Kansas, Lawrence, Jan. 1969 (ED 029 741).

141. Wax, Murray and Wax, Rosalie. DROPOUT OF AMERICAN INDIANS AT THE SECONDARY LEVEL. Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia, 1964 (ED 003 853).

142. Wax, Murray L. and Wax, Rosalie H. SUMMARY AND OBSERVATIONS IN THE DAKOTAS AND MINNESOTA. INDIAN COMMUNITIES AND PROJECT HEAD START (Part of the total report, "Indian Communities and Project Head Start--Summary and Observations in the Dakotas and Minnesota"), 1965 (ED 013 670).

143. Wax, Rosalie. THE WARRIOR DROPOUTS (Article reprinted from *Trans-Action*, vol. 4, no. 6, May 1967). Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri, 1967 (ED 016 529).

144. Willey, Darrell S. AN INTERDISCIPLINARY INSTITUTE FOR THE IN-SERVICE TRAINING OF TEACHERS AND OTHER SCHOOL PERSONNEL TO ACCELERATE THE SCHOOL ACCEPTANCE OF INDIAN, NEGRO, AND SPANISH-SPEAKING PUPILS OF THE SOUTHWEST. INTERIM REPORT NO. 2.
Appendix: Anderson, James G. and Safar, Dwight.
New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, 1966.

145. Willey, Darrell S. AN INTERDISCIPLINARY INSTITUTE FOR THE IN-SERVICE TRAINING OF TEACHERS AND OTHER SCHOOL PERSONNEL TO ACCELERATE THE SCHOOL ACCEPTANCE OF INDIAN, NEGRO, AND SPANISH-SPEAKING PUPILS OF THE SOUTHWEST. INTERIM REPORT NO. 3.
Appendix A. Pupil Performance Within Two Multi-Cultural Communities by Anderson, James G. and Safar, Dwight.
New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, 1967 (ED 015 795).

146. Wolcott, Harry F. KWAKIUTL VILLAGE AND SCHOOL. Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., New York, New York, 1967.

147. Woods, Richard G. INDIANS IN MINNEAPOLIS. Training Center for Community Programs, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, 1968 (ED 022 578).

148. Woods, Richard G. and Harkins, Arthur M. INDIAN EMPLOYMENT IN MINNEAPOLIS. University of Minnesota, Training Center for Community Programs, Minneapolis, 1968 (ED 021 659).

149. Yazzie, Allen D. YAZZIE REPORTS ON EDUCATION ACTIVITIES. Navajo Tribe Public Relations and Information Department. *Navajo Times*, Window Rock, Arizona, April 4, 1968 (ED 020 825).

150. Young, Robert W. ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE FOR NAVAJOS, AN OVERVIEW OF CERTAIN CULTURAL AND LINGUISTIC FACTORS. Bureau of Indian Affairs, Washington, D.C., 1968 (ED 021 655).

151. Young, Robert W. (comp.). THE NAVAJO YEARBOOK. Bureau of Indian Affairs, Washington, D.C., 1961 (ED 024 486).

152. Zintz, Miles V. THE ADJUSTMENT OF INDIAN AND NON-INDIAN CHILDREN IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF NEW MEXICO, SECTIONS 1-2. University of New Mexico (College of Education), Albuquerque, 1960 (ED 002 828).

153. Zintz, Miles V. WHAT CLASSROOM TEACHERS SHOULD KNOW ABOUT BILINGUAL EDUCATION. University of New Mexico (College of Education), Albuquerque, 1969 (ED 028 427).

Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools

New Mexico State University
Box 3-AP
Las Cruces, New Mexico 88001

A Unit of the Educational Resources Information Center
of the National Center for Educational Communication, USOE

ERIC
CRESS